THE Lutheran Quarterly

me IX AUGUST, 1957 Number 3

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume IX AUGUST, 1957 No. 3

CONTENTS

RECENT APPROACHES TO THE PSALMS ..... *John M. Stensvaag* 195

WORLD LUTHERANISM AND EVANGELIZATION ..... *John Schmidt* 213

AVENUES OF THOUGHT IN MARK'S GOSPEL ..... *Norman K. Bakken* 222

TOWARD AN EVANGELICAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS ..... *Lowell C. Green* 234

ON A PREPOSITION IN THE NICENE CREED ..... *Howard N. Bream* 250

OBSERVATIONS ON THE CHURCH AND SEGREGATION .... *M. L. Stirewalt, Jr.* 254

CHRISTIANITY AND CULTURE ..... *Walter Buschmann* 260

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

Denmark: Bishops and Church Administration ..... *J. Knudsen* 266

CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMENT

Heresy and Christianity: a Reply to Prof. Roth ..... *Victor K. Wrigley* 270

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Mowinckel, *He that Cometh* (R. J. Marshall) 276
Bright, *Early Israel in Recent History Writing* (J. M. Myers) 277
Ringgren, *The Messiah in the Old Testament* (J. M. Myers) 278
Clark, *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments* (E. H. Wahlstrom) 279
Pelikan, ed., *Luther's Works*, Vol. XXI (S. A. Rand) 280
Croxall, *Kierkegaard Commentary* (R. Thomte) 281
Wentz, *The Times Test the Church* (A. C. Rueter) 283
Kantonen, *A Theology for Christian Stewardship* (C. J. Grimstvedt) 284
Cushman, *The Prayers of Jesus* (M. S. Molvik) 284
Mosse, *A Theological German Vocabulary* (T. G. Tappert) 284
Toynbee, *An Historian's Approach to Religion* (W. H. K. Narum) 284
Niebuhr, *The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry* (E. C. Nelson) 286
Hulme, *Counseling and Theology* (G. H. Muedeking) 287

CONTRIBUTORS

JOHN M. STENSVAAG is professor of the Old Testament in Augsburg Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, who recently returned from sabbatical leave in Oslo, Norway.

JOHN SCHMIDT is pastor of the Indianola Lutheran Church (U.L.C.A.) in Columbus, Ohio.

NORMAN K. BAKKEN is pastor of Christ Church (Augustana) in Brooklyn, New York.

LOWELL C. GREEN is pastor of Peace Church (A.L.C.) in Herreid, South Dakota.

HOWARD N. BREAM is professor of Biblical Languages and Literature in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

MARTIN L. STIREWALT, JR., is professor of Religion in Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, North Carolina.

WALTER BUSCHMANN, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is a senior in Northwestern Theological Seminary, Minneapolis.

JOHANNES KNUDSEN is dean of the graduate school of the Chicago Lutheran Seminary in Maywood, Illinois.

VICTOR K. WRIGLEY is pastor of Gethsemane Church in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are ROBERT J. MARSHALL, professor of the Old Testament in the Chicago Seminary in Maywood, Illinois; JACOB M. MYERS, professor of the Old Testament in the Lutheran Seminary in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; ERIC H. WAHLSTROM, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois; SIDNEY A. RAND, executive director of the Department of Education in the E.L.C.; REIDAR THOMTE, professor of Philosophy in Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota; A. C. RUETER, pastor of Bethany Church in Tulsa, Oklahoma; CLYDE J. GRIMSTVEDT, of the Department of Stewardship in the E.L.C.; M. S. MOLVIK, pastor of First Church in Karlstad, Minnesota; WILLIAM H. K. NARUM, professor of Philosophy in St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota; E. CLIFFORD NELSON, professor of Church History in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; GEORGE H. MUEDEKING, instructor in Systematic Theology in the Pacific Seminary, Berkeley, California.

Recent Approaches to the Psalms

By John M. Stensvaag

TODAY it is quite generally recognized that a new era in the study of the Psalms began with Hermann Gunkel. He began to expound his views as early as 1904, but his famous commentary on the Psalms appeared first in 1926. Up until his time the commentators had looked at each psalm individually, seeking to discover its author and the particular historical event reflected in the psalm. This is now called the atomistic approach. Gunkel, however, became impressed by the similarity in structure and content of many of the psalms. A definite pattern repeated itself; this could hardly be accidental. Pointing to the compelling force of tradition in antiquity, Gunkel advanced the theory that religious poetry written for a certain type of occasion would conform to the traditional pattern for such poems. These patterns or types, as such, he regarded as cultic in origin—that is, as arising from temple worship. But Gunkel considered the majority of the psalms in the Bible as being expressions of personal religion, freed from such cultic associations except as to poetic form.

In classifying the psalms into types, Gunkel took into consideration both form and content. He sought to determine for each psalm "its setting in life" (*Sitz im Leben*), the kind of situation for which it was composed. As a result of his study, he found in the Psalter these five main types:

1. *Hymns.* Here the keynote is praise. These psalms were intended for use in temple worship, choral or otherwise. But there is also the probability that a number of these psalms were composed simply as an expression of the poet's personal devotion. The hymn-category contains two important sub-types: (1) Songs of Zion, hymns that exalt Jerusalem, the city of God, and (2) Songs of enthronement, hymns in which the Lord is acclaimed as King.

2. *Communal Laments.* In time of calamity or threatened disaster, the people of Israel would assemble before God. These laments were intended for use on such occasions.

3. *Royal Psalms.* These psalms are not messianic in the old sense

of the term. They relate rather to some occasion in the life of the king. That such psalms were used in temple worship is explained by the fact that the king was thought of as representing the people—his fate was their fate.

4. *Individual Laments.* These cries to God are numerous; they form the very core and backbone of the Psalter. Since God was regarded as the ultimate author of misfortune, it is likely that the afflicted Israelite sought to regain God's favor through some act of worship. Gunkel believed that many of these psalms, personal in origin, were later adapted to such ritual use. It is characteristic of this group that the calamity is described in rather general and figurative terms and that frequent reference is made to the enemies of the psalmist.

5. *Individual Songs of Thanksgiving.* Gunkel acknowledged that some of these psalms were meant to accompany the act of sacrifice and the fulfilling of vows, but he insisted that others reflect a more spiritual conception of worship which has risen above the use of sacrifices.

In addition to these five main types, Gunkel listed several others, four of which may be mentioned: (1) songs of pilgrimage, (2) communal songs of thanksgiving, (3) wisdom poetry, and (4) liturgy. The last type is characterized by antiphonal elements or dialogue and thus represents a combination of types to form a new whole. In this group belong the "prophetic liturgies," a combination of hymn and oracle which Gunkel attributed to the influence of the canonical prophets on the psalm writers.

This brief summary of Gunkel's position is intended to serve as a background for more recent developments in this area. His work enabled scholars to see the Psalter in a new and fresh way with the result that the Psalter is now "one of the most fascinating fields of research" in the Old Testament. The impact of his work is seen in almost all the newer literature. And even though few scholars agree with all the details of his classification or general observations, his method is widely regarded as sound and productive.

Next to Gunkel, the best known name in the field of Psalter research is that of Sigmund Mowinckel. Mowinckel was quick to see the significance of Gunkel's work and has attempted to advance upon it and to follow up its implications. In so doing he has made extensive use of comparative material in Babylonian, Egyptian, and Canaanite

literature. It is admitted that he has made great and lasting contributions to the understanding of the Psalms although some of his theories are of a startling and controversial nature indeed.[1]

Gunkel tended to deprecate the cult and its significance. Mowinckel reacts strongly against this, asserting that the cult, or worship service, had a much more central and vital place in the religion of Israel than Gunkel supposed. To the pious Israelite it was not empty form and perfunctory ritual, but meat and drink, life and salvation. A striking expression of this is found in Pss. 42-43, undoubtedly at one time a single psalm:

> As a hart longs for flowing streams,
> so longs my soul for thee, O God.
> My soul thirsts for God, for the living God.
> When shall I come and behold the face of God?
>
> These things I remember, as I pour out my soul:
> how I went with the throng, and led them
> in procession to the house of God,
> with glad shouts and songs of thanksgiving,
> a multitude keeping festival.
>
> O send out thy light and thy truth;
> let them lead me; let them bring me
> to thy holy hill and to thy dwelling!
>
> Then I will go to the altar of God,
> to God my exceeding joy;
> and I will praise thee with the lyre,
> O God, my God.

As we read these lines today, we are apt to spiritualize the terms. This is certainly permissible, but in the process we are likely to lose touch with the actual situation of the psalmist. Mowinckel, on the other hand, has endeavored to live imaginatively in the times of the Psalter and by so doing has helped to bring the psalmists to life. We see the "multitude keeping festival"; we hear the miseries and hallelujahs rising with the incense from the temple courts.

1 S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien*, I-VI (Oslo, 1921-24). For Mowinckel's more recent views, see now *Offersang og Sangoffer* (Oslo, 1951).

Once we are made aware of it, we discover that the psalms are full of allusions to the temple and its worship. References are made to sacrifices and processions, to trumpets and vows.[2] A number of psalms, furthermore, are explicitly designated for use in the ritual. The Law, as such, makes very little reference to the part played by the individual and the congregation in worship; its directions are chiefly for the priests. But from such passages as Deut. 26:1-15 and Jer. 33:11 it is clear that the congregation was not mute. Deut. 26 contains the responses expected from the worshiper in the ritual of the offering of the first fruits, and in Jeremiah we read:

> There [i.e. in Jerusalem] shall be heard again . . .
> the voices of those who sing
> as they bring thank offerings to the house of the Lord:
> "Give thanks to the Lord of hosts,
> for the Lord is good.
> for his steadfast love endures forever."

It is clear both from its content and superscription that Ps. 100 was used on precisely such an occasion. We have a right to conclude, therefore, that the rites in the temple included liturgical expressions on the part of the worshiper and congregation and that the most likely place to find these is in the Psalter. Mowinckel contends that we must assume every psalm to be cultic and only exclude from this category such psalms as upon close examination are found to be incompatible with a liturgical use. He himself finds the number of such psalms to be exceedingly low—about twelve in all. Others take a more moderate position.

Gunkel held that the psalm types as such have their origin in the cult but that most of the poems in the present Psalter are "private religious compositions." Mowinckel goes to the other extreme by asserting that most of the psalms were composed by members of the temple staff—that is, by "poets belonging to the temple singers." As evidence of this he points to the fact that many psalms show a surprising uniformity, containing many stereotyped expressions and being void of anything concrete and specific. The latter is understandable if the psalm is to have the universal validity required in the cult. It should

2 Cf. W. S. McCullough, *The Book of Psalms* (Interpreter's Bible, New York, 1955), p. 13.

also have been pointed out, however, that many of the psalms are highly individualistic and original in character. The truth as to authorship is probably somewhere between the two extremes of Gunkel and Mowinckel.[3]

In discussing the authorship of the psalms, Mowinckel made a suggestion which has intrigued many scholars. It is a known fact that many psalms contain an oracular element, that is, a revelation or declaration from the Lord. An example of this is found in Ps. 12.

> Help, Lord; for there is no longer any that is godly;
> for the faithful have vanished from among the sons of men.
> Everyone utters lies to his neighbor;
> with flattering lips and a double heart they speak.
>
> "Because the poor are despoiled, because the needy groan,
> I will now arise," says the Lord;
> "I will place him in the safety for which he longs."

These oracular elements, being in the style of prophetic utterances, were attributed by Gunkel to the influence of the canonical prophets on the psalm writers. Mowinckel, however, raised the question as to whether such oracles should not rather be ascribed to prophets connected with the temple. That there were cultic prophets seems certain; Haggai and Habakkuk were probably among them.

The oracles in the Psalms are always positive, bringing assurance of help and good fortune. This may give rise to the suspicion that they are in the spirit of the false prophets, promising peace where there is no peace. But Mowinckel points out that the divine promise is conditioned upon certain ethical and religious qualities in the supplicant, and he refers by way of analogy to our use of absolution. In any case, it would be a mistake to think that there were no true prophets apart from the canonical prophets.

Mowinckel's suggestion has raised anew the whole question of the relationship of the canonical prophets to the cult. And whereas Wellhausen and his disciples placed the prophets in sharp antithesis to the cult, the tendency now is in the direction of associating the prophets with the official cult, even to making the canonical prophets members

3 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

of temple prophetic guilds. Here the pendulum swings too far, no doubt, but the trend bears unconscious witness to the truth that the cult, no less than the prophets, was established by God. Consequently the two could not be in basic conflict.

Many of the psalms are in the first person singular. Smend proposed that the "I" was a collective, and that the speaker in all these psalms was the congregation. This would fit in well with the cultic view. However, after Balla showed such exegesis to be untenable, the collective interpretation was largely abandoned. Mowinckel now asserts that there are, nevertheless, elements of truth in Smend's position. The key to a right understanding of many "I" psalms is the king, who is now regarded as having played a prominent part in the cult. This phenomenon is traced back to the influence of the king-ideologies of the surrounding cultures.

In Egypt as well as in Mesopotamia the king was regarded as divine and as representing the gods to the people and the people to the gods. Mowinckel is careful to emphasize that these Oriental conceptions regarding the king were sharply modified in Israel. The king is indeed spoken of as the "son of God" (I Chr. 22:10), but the formula used is that of adoption. The Israelite king was not regarded as divine, but he did stand in a special relation to God. He was the mediator between God and the people. Through him the divine blessings came upon Israel, and when he was in disfavor with God misfortune befell the entire nation. No wonder, then, that the cult, the divine service, gave a prominent place to the king and his acts of worship.

One of the Royal Psalms, Ps. 20, was evidently used in a temple service just prior to the king's departure for battle. The king has offered sacrifices and prayed for divine assistance. In the first part of the psalm he receives in answer a divine blessing through the lips of the priest:

> May he send you help from the sanctuary,
> and give you support from Zion!
> May he remember all your offerings,
> and regard with favor your burnt sacrifices!
> May we shout for joy over your victory,
> and in the name of our God set up our banners!
> May the Lord fulfill all your petitions!

The king, strengthened and encouraged by this blessing, says:

> Now I know that the Lord will help his anointed;
> he will answer him from his holy heaven
> with mighty victories by his right hand.

Similarly the other Royal Psalms, such as Pss. 2 and 110, are interpreted in relation to the earthly king. But Mowinckel goes beyond Gunkel in maintaining that the "I" in many of the other psalms also refers to the king, the king acting on behalf of the people. Thus, in effect, the category of Royal Psalms is greatly enlarged. This, then, is the element of truth in Smend's theory of a collective "I." At the same time it does justice to the well-known fact that so many psalms are ascribed to King David. Mowinckel interprets "for David" as meaning "for the current David," that is, for the king's use. He admits, however, that in the course of time, and especially after the exile, a "democratization" took place so that psalms once reserved for the use of the king now became common property.

Mowinckel denies that any of the Royal Psalms are eschatological in origin. They were written for the earthly king. It is true, however, that in all these psalms it is the ideal king, the king as he ought to be, who is being depicted. Consequently it is not without justice that late Judaism and the early church came to regard them as messianic. Terrien goes a step further when he says that though several of these psalms may have been written in honor of a human king, "they probably received their final edited form and certainly obtained their liturgical use in the context of the messianic hope."[4]

Gunkel had stressed the importance of ascertaining the "place in life" of the psalms, but had minimized the cultic connections. Mowinckel, as has become evident by now, regards this as a mistake. He holds that the psalms were composed largely for use at the great annual feasts and that we cannot fully understand a psalm and its situation in life until it is placed in clear connection with the proper feast. He observes, by way of analogy, that a baptism or communion hymn cannot be fully appreciated until it is seen in relation to the rite to which it pertains.

The chief feast in ancient Israel, according to Mowinckel, was the autumnal New Year Festival. Such a festival is not directly mentioned

4 Samuel Terrien, *The Psalms and Their Meaning for Today* (Indianapolis, 1952), p. 91.

in the Bible, but it was practiced in surrounding cultures. Mowinckel, therefore, largely on the basis of Babylonian parallels, has attempted to find this festival within the Psalter and to reconstruct something of the ritual employed on this feast. The result is in some ways his most important, as well as most controversial, contribution to the understanding of the Psalter.

Mowinckel claims that at the great New Year Festival the people annually celebrated the Lord's coming as king and his ascension to the throne, and that this was acted out in a great religious drama. The festival came just at the beginning of the rainy season which brought life to the dry, parched ground. A key motif in the feast, therefore, was the coming of God himself, repeating as Creator his victory over the forces of death and chaos, and making the world new and fruitful for his people. But God is also hailed as the Creator of the people of Israel who now repeats his saving work in Egypt and at the Red Sea, delivering Israel from all her foes and renewing his covenant with her.

And all this is not simply a celebration of something which occurred in the past (or is expected in the future), but it is a present experience. God comes, God acts, God takes his place on the throne. He makes all things new, assuring for king and people, as long as they keep his covenant, a prosperous and victorious year. Similarly, says Mowinckel, but in a less acute sense, we as Christians do not simply remember the birth of Christ at Christmas but experience it as a present reality. Unto us "is born *this day* . . . a Savior!" So also at Easter. Ps. 47, which is regarded as a New Year psalm, reflects the mood of the people on this great occasion:

> Clap your hands, all peoples!
> Shout to God with loud songs of joy!
> For the Lord, the Most High, is terrible,
> a great king over all the earth.
> He subdued peoples under us,
> and nations under our feet.
>
> God has gone up with a shout,
> the Lord with the sound of the trumpet.
> Sing praises to our King, sing praises!
> God reigns over the nations;
> God sits on his holy throne.

Many rites and ceremonies were used in this rich and complex festival. These are for the most part lost to us. But Mowinckel feels certain that he has uncovered at least one important ritual, namely, the festal procession. This is referred to or described in Pss. 24, 118, and 132. In this procession the Lord's presence was symbolized by the sacred ark which was annually brought up to Jerusalem and placed in the temple. In this way the coming of the Lord and his enthronement as king were dramatized.

Mowinckel believes that Ps. 24 was a part of this liturgy. His treatment of this psalm is intriguing and suggestive, even though he may be mistaken in connecting it with his New Year festival:

As the pilgrim or festal procession approaches the temple, it raises a hymn of praise to God, the Creator:

> The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof,
> the world and those who dwell therein;
> for he has founded it upon the seas,
> and established it upon the rivers.

Each temple had certain rites and requirements, and before entering the pilgrims would have to know these. Therefore, as the procession comes up to the gates of the temple, the spokesman for the group asks:

> Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord?
> And who shall stand in his holy place?

And the temple guard answers:

> He who has clean hands and a pure heart,
> who does not lift up his soul to what is false,
> and does not swear deceitfully.
> He will receive blessing from the Lord.

To this the spokesman replies:

> This is the generation of those who seek him.

Or, in other words, "We who come are such a people." This may

sound brash, but Mowinckel points out that all liturgy is based on the assumption that the congregation is in principle in a right relation to God. As a congregation they are fit to come in. But the thought would be that each individual must examine himself and, if unfit, draw back.[5]

Hearing the affirmative answer, the temple guard opens the gates as the chorus sings:

> Lift up your heads, O gates!
> and be lifted up, O ancient doors!
> That the King of glory may come in.

The switch here from pilgrims to divine king is troublesome, but Mowinckel assumes that at the very head of the procession is the holy ark representing God as he returns home after a great victory. The thought, then, is that the gates are not high enough to accommodate the divine King who now makes his entry at the head of his faithful people.

Just how we are to understand this psalm and its various parts remains a problem, but Mowinckel's imaginative recreation of the liturgical situation is certainly exciting and points the way to the understanding of this and many other psalms.

The Enthronement Psalms proper were supposedly sung after the Lord had taken his place on the throne. The characteristic phrase in these psalms is "The Lord reigns," which Mowinckel claims should more accurately be translated, "The Lord has become King!" He rejects Gunkel's eschatological interpretation which saw in these psalms a prophetic description of the Lord's coming at the end of time to establish his eternal kingdom. No, the coming spoken of here is a coming in the cult, an annual experience. It is true that the psalms are marked by expectation, but it is expectation of great works by God now, seeing that he has ascended the throne anew. This is how he interprets the phrase, "He comes to judge the earth." However, Mowinckel admits that after the destruction of the southern kingdom, the prophets made use of many concrete images taken from the enthronement psalms and feast in proclaiming the future restoration of Israel, and that in time the psalms themselves came to be interpreted eschatologically.

5 Cf. Joh. Lindblom, *Israels Religion i Gammaltestamentlig Tid* (Stockholm, 1953), p. 138.

So much for Mowinckel's reconstruction of the New Year Festival. What have been the reactions in scholarly circles? On the one extreme is the so-called "Myth and Ritual School" whose best known representative is S. H. Hooke. This group embraced Mowinckel's theory with enthusiasm and proceeded to elaborate upon it. Comparative studies supposedly uncovered a myth and ritual pattern common, in antiquity, to the entire Near East. "The chief elements in the pattern are: the drama of the death and resurrection of the god, the recapitulation in act or word of the creation myth, the mimic battle in which the god overthrew his enemies, the sacred marriage, the triumphal procession of the victorious god who was represented by the earthly king."[6]

The shocking thing is that this school makes no substantial distinction between Israel and her pagan neighbors, but assumes that these rites were observed also in Israel in connection with the New Year and other festivals. The scholar who has carried this view to its ultimate extreme is I. Engnell of Uppsala. "He regards the king, in his cultic role, as identical both with the creator high god and also with the dying and rising vegetation god, and, as such, playing a decisive part, both as the suffering servant of Yahweh and as the victor over the powers of chaos."[7]

Mowinckel has repeatedly expressed concern over this turn of events. It is true that Israel was influenced by the religious patterns in surrounding cultures, but it is equally true that Israel's religion was something unique, that her God was not like the gods of the nations. The extreme position of Hooke and Engnell has been decisively refuted by first-rate Old Testament scholars. The idea of a dying and rising vegetation god and of a sacred marriage and the idea that the king was in any sense identical with the deity are completely foreign to the Old Testament and incompatible with its religion. Furthermore, few scholars take seriously the claim that the Davidic king played the part of God in any ritual drama, although some do assign to the king an important part in such supposed cultic dramas.[8]

Some, on the other hand, have gone the other way and rejected

6 G. W. Anderson, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. by H. H. Rowley (London, 1951), p. 293.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 296.

8 Cf. A. R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship* (Cardiff, 1955).

completely Mowinckel's theory of the New Year festival and the Lord's annual enthronement. They point out that his reconstruction is highly speculative. There is no decisive, pre-exilic evidence for the celebration of the Lord's enthronement in connection with a New Year festival. Even scholars friendly to his theory are likely to admit that Mowinckel "overstates his case." This would certainly appear likely from the fact that he assigns more than forty psalms to a festival which is not once mentioned explicitly in the Old Testament.

However, when all is said and done, scholars are left with the uneasy feeling that there may be something to what Mowinckel says after all. W. S. McCullough, writing in the "Interpreter's Bible," observes: "The idea that the Hebrew God could in any real sense be enthroned annually was poor theology, and could hardly have been seriously held by the nation's religious leaders. At the most there may have been some public recognition on the New Year's Day of the Lord's sovereign power."[9] Prof. Terrien doubts that there ever was an annual procession in which the ark was carried and placed in the temple to dramatize the ascension of the Lord to his throne. Nevertheless, in commenting on Ps. 47 he writes: "It seems likely that Ps. 47 was composed in order to celebrate the kingship of God at the occasion of the New Year festival, but the term 'enthronement' is probably not fitting unless it be used metaphorically."[10]

At least Mowinckel has managed to make the students of the Psalter aware that the people of Israel lived in a situation quite different from ours, a situation in which temple worship and religious festivals were a vital factor in the life of the godly. No scholarly approach to the Psalms will henceforth be able to ignore this fact.

We turn now to another major problem facing the students of the Psalter. The Individual Laments, comprising a large number of psalms, are, as already indicated, full of references to enemies. The question is, Who are these enemies of the psalmists? A number of answers have been suggested.

Hermann Gunkel himself classified the enemies into two groups: (1) Neighbors and friends of the sufferer who saw in his affliction a retribution for some sin and who consequently criticized him or stood

9 *Op. cit.*, p. 7.
10 *Op. cit.*, p. 77.

aloof from him. To the sufferer they would seem like enemies. The experience of Job in this regard is an instructive parallel. (2) Men of power and wealth who oppressed the poor, and irreligious men who scorned the faith of the pious, perhaps even to the point of persecution. The psalms reflect divisions and cleavages within society. This religio-sociological explanation is reasonable and convincing and has won a large measure of support.[11]

Mowinckel, however, has advanced the startling theory that the enemies of the psalmists are sorcerers and their demonic allies. He insists that the phrase, "workers of evil," which occurs in several of these psalms is a technical term for those who practice black magic. The sufferer in the psalms believes that his sickness or other misfortune is the direct result of such nefarious spells. The individual laments, therefore, are not private outpourings but are pieces composed by the temple poets for use in a temple purification ritual. The fact that these psalms sometimes reveal an abrupt change from lamentation to joyous confidence is explained by the assumption that a priestly oracle intervened which assured the sufferer that his prayer had been heard. Psalm 6 may be used as an example:

> O Lord, rebuke me not in thy anger,
> nor chasten me in thy wrath.
> Turn, O Lord, save my life:
> deliver me for the sake of thy steadfast love.
> I am weary with my moaning;
> My eye wastes away because of grief,
> it grows weak because of all my foes.
> Depart from me, all you workers of evil;
> for the Lord has heard the sound of my weeping.
> The Lord has heard my supplication;
> The Lord accepts my prayer.

Nicolsky, following up this lead, has attempted to find traces of magic formulas or counter spells in the Psalms, particularly in the imprecatory psalms.[12] But his work is not convincing. Mowinckel's theory has, in fact, been decisively refuted. The enemies in the psalms are never made responsible for the origin of the sickness; they only

11 Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms* (London, 1939), p. 64.
12 N. Nicolsky, *Spuren magischer Formeln in den Psalmen* (Giessen, 1927).

appear afterwards and aggravate the sufferer's plight. Furthermore, if the "words" of the enemies were really magic spells, they would have been labeled as such in the psalmist's complaint to God. Again, the phrase "workers of evil" is clearly used in the general sense of evil-doers. Consequently, there is no evidence at all that the enemies complained of in the psalms were sorcerers. The theory is not so far fetched as it seems, however. Black magic and incantations were common in the surrounding cultures, and the possibility certainly exists that some of the sufferers in the psalms may have feared sorcery and magic spells, may have believed in divination.

An entirely different explanation of the enemies has been proposed by Hans Schmidt. He contends that the enemies, in many instances, are men who have accused the psalmist of some specific crime. For some reason, perhaps for lack of evidence, the only way for the accused to clear himself is through trial by ordeal. The accused would appear in the temple, take an oath that he was innocent of the crime, call upon God to vindicate him, and submit to the ordeal. Schmidt seeks support for his view in an interesting but obscure passage in the dedicatory prayer of Solomon:

> If a man sins against his neighbor and is made to take an oath, and comes and swears his oath before thine altar in this house, then hear thou in heaven and act, and judge thy servants, condemning the guilty by bringing his conduct upon his own head, and vindicating the righteous by rewarding him according to his righteousness. (I Kings 8:31 f.)

In some cases the psalmist who complains of enemies is clearly a sick man. This is explained by reference to the retribution theory. The man's sickness and misfortune gave rise to speculation as to what sin he might have committed, and the tendency would be to accuse him of some unsolved crime in the community. He would then be in the dreadful fix of being sick and accused at the same time. The fact that many laments close with a hymn of thanksgiving is attributed to the successful outcome of the ordeal.

Although Schmidt's theory is ingenious and attractive, it has found little support among scholars.[13] By regarding most of the Individual

13 See, however, Aage Bentzen, *Fortolkning til de Gammeltestamentlige Salmer* (Copenhagen, 1939), p. 22, and E. A. Leslie, *The Psalms* (Nashville, 1949).

Laments, including practically all the sick-psalms, as prayers of accused men, he has given to the ordeal an altogether disproportionate place. If his theory were true, it would make the accusers and the ordeal the most dreaded evil in Israel. In view of the fact that the ordeal is scarcely mentioned in the Bible, such a situation is completely incredible.[14] It may also be noted that there are psalms with an abrupt change from prayer to thanksgiving which even Schmidt cannot fit into his group. But untenable as this theory is in the main, it has the merit of calling attention to a little known aspect of Hebrew life and should be given consideration as a possible explanation of a few of the psalms in question, such as Pss. 5 and 7.

The most recent attempt to identify the enemies has been made by H. Birkeland, a former student of Mowinckel. After a careful study of the enemies in the Royal Psalms and Communal Laments, he has come to the conclusion that the foes in the individual Laments are, for the most part, hostile foreigners and that the "I" who speaks in these psalms is the Israelite king or other high official. He claims that in only two such psalms is there clear evidence of sickness (Pss. 38 and 41), and here, admittedly, the enemies are fellow-countrymen, perhaps engaged in court intrigues. But otherwise the afflicted and the godly are the Israelites as a whole, and the wicked and ungodly are foreigners who seek to hurt Israel, sometimes by bringing false and slanderous accusations against the king of Israel to his overlord.

There is no doubt that the language of these psalms abounds in references to war and intrigue, and this makes it rather likely that there is a measure of truth in Birkeland's position. But he, too, tends to overstate his case. His contention that the speaker in *all* these psalms is the king or the head of the armed forces is not likely to pass muster. It is true that the language of the psalmist often seems unsuited to a mere commoner, but we must be careful not to impose our literary canons on ancient, Israelite compositions.

It is interesting that Mowinckel in a discussion of Birkeland's view at last concludes that no single formula is ever likely to solve the problem of the identity of the enemies. This is undoubtedly correct. The life that flows through the Psalter is too rich and varied for that. The religio-sociological interpretation advanced by Gunkel is

14 Cf. Num. 5:11 ff.; Ex. 22:7 ff.; Deut. 17:8 ff.

still the most attractive. It takes into account the complexity of the forces giving rise to enmity as well as the existence of a variety of hostile manifestations. But it is quite likely that a cautious use of Birkeland's findings may further enrich Gunkel's interpretation by enlarging the circle of foes to include, in certain instances, hostile foreigners.

In conclusion we may note a number of results which seem to emerge from this study. In the first place, it is evident that there was a much closer tie-up between the psalms and temple worship than we are wont to realize. Many of the psalms were undoubtedly used by individuals and congregations in connection with the offering of sacrifices and the performing of other rites in the temple. And this should again make us aware that temple worship was a vital element in Old Testament religion, a true meeting of God and man. How else are we to understand these words of the psalmist in Ps. 84?

> How lovely is thy dwelling place,
> O Lord of hosts!
> My soul longs, yea, faints
> for the courts of the Lord;
> my heart and flesh sing for joy
> to the living God.
>
> Blessed are those who dwell in thy house,
> ever singing thy praises!
>
> For a day in thy courts is better
> than a thousand elsewhere.

No wonder that another psalmist cried out (Ps. 122:1),

> I was glad when they said to me,
> Let us go to the house of the Lord!

Perhaps without realizing it we have tended to accept the Wellhausian theses that the temple cult was an inferior type of religion and that the chief endeavor of the prophets was to lead the people upward to a purely spiritual worship "freed from the trappings and trammels of the cultus." That this is a misrepresentation of the message of the prophets is easily proved. Quite clearly the prophets considered temple worship as ordained by God and participated in it.

At the same time the present tendency toward identifying the canonical prophets with the cult so closely as to make them members of temple prophetic guilds is almost certainly an extreme swing of the pendulum. The great canonical prophets did not wish to dispose of the cult, but they denounced the vain and hypocritical worship of priest and people in such violent language as to make it extremely unlikely that they received their bread from the hands of the priests or from the "congregational budget."

Another important consequence of the newer approaches to the Psalms is the tendency to date many of the psalms much earlier than had been customary. Wellhausen, with his emphasis on the personal, non-cultic origin of the psalms, once decreed that "without Jeremiah the psalms would not have been written." And Robert Pfeiffer, still trying to maintain the viewpoint of a generation ago, declares: "With the exception of Ps. 24:7-10 . . . there is no psalm that could conceivably have been used in the ritual of the pre-exilic period."[15]

At present, however, the trend is to assign to the Israelite king a large place in the cult. This means that many psalms previously regarded as messianic and post-exilic are now seen as designed for the use of the kings in the temple service. Furthermore, the number of Royal Psalms has been largely increased by supposing that many "I" psalms were composed for the king, as representing the nation. If this view is correct, these psalms must of course have originated in the time of the monarchy.[16] This tendency to up-date many of the psalms also finds strong support in the Canaanite comparative material discovered at Ras Shamra (Ugarit) in 1929. All of which encourages me in the belief that biblical scholarship will, when given time enough, correct its own aberrations. It is a matter of being patient, of having confidence in God and his Word, while at the same time endeavoring diligently to glean whatever truth there is in the constant searchings and theorizings of scholars.

Finally, we have been reminded anew of how important it is to seek to live ourselves into the actual situation reflected in the Psalms so that we may see through the eyes of the godly in Israel his temple worship, annual feasts, current theology, fears and longings. This is

15 R. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1941), p. 633.

16 Cf. Terrien: "Modern scholarship tends to admit that the core of several pieces comes from David himself or even from pre-Hebraic poets." *Op. cit.*, p. 32.

not easy for twentieth century man with his jet planes, TV, and radar. But the effort is rewarding. For the closer we come to the psalmist, the better we will understand his words and his inmost life with God. And as the difficulties and perplexities of his situation take on new reality for us, it will amaze us perhaps most of all to discover that the dominant note in the Psalter is one of joy. The circumstances, the environment cannot explain this joy. It is a joy which bears witness to a sorely tried but triumphant faith.

World Lutheranism and Evangelization

By John Schmidt

THE fact that the Lutheran Church designates itself as Evangelical is in itself the measure of both its task and promise as regards the evangelization of the nations. If we are truly believers in God's Gospel of sheer grace, there can be no self-imposed limit to our evangelistic mission, whether in a land where our church is well-established or in one where its voice has not yet been heard. This is true, not because of any pompous desire for organizational imperialism (to which the organized church is certainly vulnerable, since its members are only "becoming-Christians"), but because God's evangel is intended by him to be universal. Any attempt to restrict our witness to "born Lutherans" of German or Scandinavian ancestry is, then, a denial of our very nature. Even such "born Lutherans" need to be "born again," just as do other men. And, on the other hand, if there is that about our proclamation that restricts its appeal to those sharing a certain temperamental and sociological background, we are under compulsion to re-examine our witness to remove from it those elements that are foreign to God's universal evangel.

For the purposes of this article I shall in some sense equate the term "world Lutheranism" with the Lutheran World Federation, even though they do not completely coincide. Not every Lutheran church in the world, unfortunately, has been willing to enter into this worldwide fellowship of co-operation and federation. Furthermore, the Lutheran World Federation does not engage *directly* in the evangelization of the world, since it is not itself a church. Rather does it seek to enlist and stimulate the activity of its member churches. It seeks to co-ordinate such activity and, where necessary, to open eyes to unrecognized and unanswered needs.

I

The first service to the cause of evangelizing the nations may be described as *clarifying the Gospel.*

The Lutheran World Federation seeks to achieve this purpose through its Department of Theology, under the leadership of Dr. Vilmos Vajta, a Hungarian who is now a Swedish subject. The experience of these few years has already demonstrated that there exists a need for further clarification of the evangel as Lutherans understand it and that the Federation can make a significant contribution in this area.

In part, this is done through the theoretical discussions and documents that result from the Assemblies. The two Lutheran churches of the Netherlands, for example, had been divided since the day that Rationalism dominated theological thought within the church of the Reformation. Discussions between the two had been fruitless, largely because in such cases each party continues to express itself in the traditional terms of bygone controversy without becoming aware of the fact that language may conceal as well as reveal thought. Only the fresh language in which the Lund Assembly re-expressed Reformation truth broke through this crust. Both bodies realized that they were happy to accept the truth thus stated, and a reunion was accomplished. This was, obviously, a factor of vital importance in a land where even a united Lutheran church represents but a small minority of the population.

On the other side of the world, also, the Federation was able to assist a doctrinally undifferentiated Batak church to achieve clarification of its own understanding of the Gospel. Here the result was not a mere acceptance of the historical Confessions of the Lutheran Church, since the need in Sumatra is not to define the Gospel *vis a vis* the heresies of Rome, but rather in terms of the amorphous Moslem-Hindu-pagan environment within which the Batak church must make its witness.

Similar assistance has been given to Lutheran theologians in South India, where a relatively small (in proportion to its Hindu environment) Lutheran church is confronted with the need to spell out carefully its relationship to non-Lutheran Christian bodies. In addition to the wholly Christian impulse to recognize the reality of the unity in Christ that does exist within the total body of Christian believers, the South India situation is compounded by such strong, though non-theological, considerations as their own relative weakness, the religious eclecticism of their Hindu environment, and the pressures of a new

nationalism. It is clear that these problems cannot be resolved by the imposition of any type of ecclesiastical imperialism (even if it should be attempted), but only from the free decision of those whose decision it must be. Yet since our very involvement in a difficult situation may prevent us from bringing it into clear focus, a genuine service may be given us through the brotherly counsel of outsiders who are willing to place their own experience and wisdom at our disposal.

But it is not merely such smaller or "younger" churches that will benefit from the work of the LWF theological department. Every church suffers from the temptation of assuming that fruitful theological discussion can exist only within itself, or at least by those speaking its language. When I was a student in Germany, I heard no discussion whatever of any American theologian, or indeed of any Scandinavian. It was apparently assumed that only Germans were capable of making any significant contribution to theological thought. And, much more recently, I have heard of American Lutheran leaders who have casually shrugged off the insights of such men as Aulen and Nygren without making any serious effort to understand what they were saying. Yet the message of the Lutheran Church anywhere, if it is to be truly Evangelical, dare not be limited to a single national pattern or language.

Often such an interchange of ideas will be disturbing. But only so can most men be forced to the hard work of thinking. It is much easier to parrot phrases. Since the "heresy trials" of the Synod of the Northwest began, it seemed to me that some of the "defenders of the faith" revealed clearly that they had not even been aware of the questions to which the accused pastors had, in my judgment, found the wrong answers. It would be expecting too much to hope that Dr. Vajta's work would make every pastor of every Lutheran church in every country into a theologian, but it may possibly assist in making more clear to us all the living heart of God's redemptive message which we have been commissioned to proclaim. A beginning has been made toward transforming the post-war theological conferences held in various European countries into a two-way program. It is to be hoped that increasingly pastors and concerned laymen of *all* national Lutheran churches may have opportunity to hear some of the outstanding theological figures of other lands and traditions. Much may come also of the plans of LWF's Department of Theology to inspire and, where needful, aid in

a program of translation of the scholarly product of our world church. In these and other ways the message of the Gospel may be clarified and thus more effectively proclaimed.

II

The second contribution which world Lutheranism, through LWF, can make toward the evangelization of the world is *through living the Gospel.* Bishop Hanns Lilje has often commented upon the paradoxical fact that the Lutheran Church, which has always emphasized the centrality of faith, should in actual fact have been brought into a worldwide fellowship through its love. Yet, as he has then pointed out, this is not strange, since in the understanding of both Paul and Luther true faith cannot be separated from works of love. The latter's *Sermon on Good Works* and *Treatise on Christian Liberty* evidence this clearly.

At the end of each world war American and Scandinavian Lutherans were compelled by such living faith to aid their brethren in distress. In addition to bearing our proper share in the general work of the World Council of Churches we have conducted a parallel program in the fields of refugee service and inter-church aid that was as large as that carried on by WCC. The direct relationship between this service of love and the task of evangelization can be illustrated most clearly, perhaps, in the Arab countries. There Lutheran World Relief and LWF's Service to Refugees began a ministry to people, virtually none of whom were Lutheran or even Christian. All aid (and a vast amount was given) is distributed solely on a basis of need. This work is not done as a "cover" for evangelistic work. We acted simply because we were constrained by the love of God in Christ to help wherever we could. Yet, as a consequence, there are today open doors in the Moslem world because for the first time in many centuries the Arabs have seen a Christian church that was concerned not about self-interest but rather about an opportunity to serve those in need. We ought to be under no illusions. Not every refugee who has been aided by Lutherans will be, the rest of his life, an active and thankful member. Many, like those healed by diseases by Christ himself, will perhaps stand in cowardly silence when the mob roars "Crucify," even if they do not themselves join in the shout. But there will also be

thankful "Samaritans" among them who will give grateful praise to God.

The establishment of a new Department of World Service is a recognition of the fact that "the poor ye have always with you." This has become "the century of the homeless," and the flood of new refugees shows no sign of abating. In addition, there are always new and unexpected needs for which we must be prepared—for instance, the California floods, whose victims could be helped at once from the stocks of clothing in LWR warehouses on the West Coast. When for a few brief days the iron curtain about Hungary was lifted, it was unnecessary to improvise hasty relief programs to gather clothing, medicine, and food since such supplies were already "in the pipeline" and could easily be diverted to new and urgent needs. When the floods occurred in Holland a few years earlier, LWR was able to divert, without waste of time, shipments of clothing, food, and medicine from Bremerhaven to the Netherlands. The special role of an international agency can be illustrated at this point. The German churches gave a generous offering for the Dutch refugees. It was their first opportunity, as they said, to say "thank you" for the abundant help they themselves had received since World War II. But our Geneva office had in the meantime learned that the immediate emergency needs in Holland had been met. From a three-way conversation between Munich, Amsterdam, and Geneva came this scheme: German money was used to make furniture in refugee training schools, established in that country to aid in the rehabilitation of handicapped refugees and the training of youthful refugees, and this furniture was then delivered to Holland, where it replaced the furniture in flooded homes.

If there is one criticism that can legitimately be made of this program to date, it would be that it has been carried on too much in a context of the European world. Increasingly it must become truly a program of *world* service.

But not all brotherly aid consists of aid to refugees and the physically distressed. The program of inter-church aid continues, but on a broader basis. Now it is no longer an almost exclusively American operation, as at its beginning. Every Lutheran church must become aware that "where one member suffers, all the members suffer with it."

There are dangerous pitfalls in the way. Can such assistance be given without, in fairness to the original donors, requiring "improve-

ments" in the program that will make it possible, at a later date, to dispense with outside help? How, then, does one avoid ecclesiastical "dollar diplomacy" whereby the donor forces the receiver to submit to dictation? Frankly, the members of the Commission on World Service have been given a very difficult assignment! To be specific: To what extent should assistance to our brethren of the Lutheran churches of Italy and Spain be made conditional upon their willingness to change from being an outpost of German culture, with the task of giving a spiritual ministry to German residents in these countries, to becoming churches that proclaim the Gospel also in the language and to the people of the land?

A problem of a different type confronts us in the churches that lie behind the iron curtain. Would our recognition of the "de facto" leadership of such churches strengthen the position of men who, perhaps for unworthy reasons, took the reins of leadership from men who had opposed Communist aggression? On the other hand, can we withhold assistance from a church that is in desperate need merely because we do not like its present leadership? In such circumstances we must truly be "as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves!"

Fortunately such perplexities are not everywhere present. In Holland, for example, there are some problems that loom very large to this small church but which seem small when compared with our more adequate resources in America. Yet how can such a small group afford to print catechetical literature or hymnals, badly needed as these are, when the prospective market is so small that a publisher could not expect to recoup his investment for many years? In this very instance we can see how intimate is the relation between "living the Gospel" and the evangelization of the nations. Unless those of our Lutheran churches that are strong are willing to look beyond their own needs and wants, world Lutheranism cannot carry out its assigned task.

III

In the third place, world Lutheranism, as represented in LWF, must contribute to the evangelization of the world by *proclaiming the Gospel.* Organizationally this is expressed in the Commission on World Missions that was headed during its formative period by Dr. Fredrik

A. Schiotz and later by Dr. Fristjov Birkeli, of Norway. It is noteworthy that this Commission includes two members from the Far East.

World Lutheranism has just celebrated the beginning of Protestant mission work, the arrival of Ziegenbalg and Pluetschau in Tranquebar 250 years ago. It seems to me that there were two significant things symbolized by a photograph taken at the anniversary celebration. One is the fact that the new bishop of this Lutheran church is, for the first time (and only after a quarter-millenium!) a distinguished and able Indian. (Fortunately, not all Lutheran churches in India have been so tardy.) The other is that he stood before a memorial tablet, erected in honor of the missionary pioneers, on which the language was German. Could the "foreignness" of much of our missionary work be better symbolized?

How hard it is to learn that the churches that have been born as the result of our missionary outreach need not be duplicates of our own churches in the West. It is not our goal to create Chinese or Malayan members of an American Norwegian Lutheran Church in Malaya! We must be willing to allow local and national expressions of liturgy, hymnology, prayer, church polity, and order. This should not seem strange to Lutherans who have been taught that Art. VII of the Augsburg Confession asserts that the true essence of the church consists in agreement "concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments," however far we have wandered from this teaching in our practice.

We ought to rejoice, therefore, that our Church, through LWF, pioneered in calling together two great Christian conferences—"great" not because of their numbers but because of the fruit that they may, under God, bear. The first of these was the All-Africa Lutheran Conference held in Marangua, Tanganyika, and the second the All-Asia meeting in Tranquebar. Here the spokesmen of Lutheranism were men with black and brown faces who spoke languages unknown to the Reformers. Yet these men, and those whom they represent, must lead the most populous portions of the earth at a time when the pace of transition from a stable (if unsatisfactory) past to an undetermined future is accelerating. Recently we had as guest in our congregation and home a cultured gentleman from Indonesia. He is a member of our Batak church who holds an important position in the educational system of a country with 80,000,000 people. Yet, as he told us, his own great-

grandfather was a cannibal. A visitor from Africa in the office of the National Lutheran Council recently related that his father, in accordance with tribal practice, was to have his ears pierced. A short period of instruction normally intervened between treating the two ears. Yet so rapidly did change come that the second ear was never pierced. With such speed are ancient practices being overthrown. This is the setting that underscores the importance of Marangua and Tranquebar.

A basic reorientation of our thinking, in both West and East, is required. The old distinctions between "established churches" and "foreign mission fields" is admittedly inadequate. Even to speak of "sending" and "receiving" churches has become inaccurate when the Andhra Lutheran Church of India, for example, sends personnel to Malaya and Indonesia. What is even worse, these terms reveal a failure to understand the Pauline picture of the church as one body. Can one say that the hand gives to the mouth? Each organ of a body gives and each also receives. In a given historical situation one church may give money, men, and experience while another contributes the no less valuable gifts of deep devotion and faithfulness under persecution. Can we speak of the "younger" churches of Asia when—putting aside for a moment the ancient Mar Thoma church that claims apostolic founding—even the Lutheran church in India is older than any Lutheran synod in the United States? Neither can we distinguish on the ground that our Asian and African brethren are "minority" churches, surrounded by a pagan ocean, when any realistic appraisal of the situation in America and Europe must recognize that the church in the West is also a minority church, enveloped in a "post-Christian" paganism that is possibly even more difficult to overthrow than that of Africa. Neither the old pride (now rapidly diminishing) of the Western churches nor the new pride of the East (that is such a noticeable characteristic at every ecumenical conference) has a basis in either our real situation or in our faith. There is and ought to be only a relationship of comrades, of brethren in the family of one Father, of "members" of one Body, who need mutual prayers, counsel, and assistance. It is in such a context that the task of evangelizing the world must proceed.

One very practical aspect of inter-Lutheran co-operation through the LWF Commission on World Missions must still be mentioned. The experience of two world wars and a cold war have shown that

any mission program that is dependent upon one nation for its support in personnel and money is leaning on a frail reed. Only a multi-national approach is adequate today, and obviously that requires mutual confidence between our churches and a recognition of the fact that our common faith is more important than our differing national backgrounds. The international and inter-racial team now assembled to serve in Malaya illustrates, at least in part, this newer approach. Another illustration is the fact that the Board of Foreign Missions of the United Lutheran Church has recently called two African Christians from the Gold Coast to serve in our Liberian Lutheran church, their expenses being borne by the American church. The post-war decision of mission agencies in Germany, Australia, and the United States to merge their work, budget, and staff in New Guinea is in the same line of development. Thus the evangelization of the work may be furthered by the co-operative labors of world Lutheranism.

Less directly, but no less significantly, this objective is sustained also by the LWF Commission on Stewardship and Congregational Life. If we are to evangelize the world we must translate into action the Reformation doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers. A "pastor's church" cannot measure up to the urgencies of our day, whether in Sweden, Argentina, Japan, or Ethiopia. The passive pew sitter must become aware of his responsibility to be Christ's tongue. The church need not "go out into the world of daily affairs," as it is often urged to do, for it is already there—in the person of its lay members. The tragedy has been that these laymen have not realized and acted upon their God-given responsibility. It is truly important that a well-trained leadership be provided at the earliest moment in every church, but it would be tragic if this were understood to mean that a man needs to have theological training to "speak a good word for Jesus Christ." A lamp begins to give light as soon as it is lighted —and so must every believer.

Avenues of Thought in Mark's Gospel

By Norman K. Bakken

IT IS TRUE, as Professor Grant well illustrates, that Mark is not a theologian. ". . . His 'theology' is not his own, but merely the theological interpretation—as far as it had gone in his day—of the tradition as held by the contemporary church."[1] The Gospel of Mark is a record of other voices, of another's witness, and of the reflection of a generation once removed from the scene of our Lord's ministry. What Mark might have wished he could say in his own words, and possibly could not, he had to seek in the words and thoughts of others who had been contemporaries and close associates of Jesus and his disciples. Mark reflects the fact that he is not a theologian, but he also reflects much that is of theological importance in his Gospel.

It may be well to ask, then, What are some of these reflections? What are some of the conceptions that Mark echoes? By lifting the external trappings of form, order, and chronological and geographical groupings can we perceive a kernel which would give us insight into the mind of this early Christian?

I propose to call attention to several avenues of thought along which Mark might have strolled. There is not a great deal of concrete detail by which to pave such *viae theologicae*, but let us take the material we have and see how far we can go.

It is remarkable that a writing later called a Gospel and itself purporting to tell how the Gospel began to be heralded should say so little of what the Gospel really was. We know it was "good news," but for all that Mark presupposes a good deal on the part of his readers' knowledge. So we must conclude that his work was meant for Christian reading, not as an appeal to the uninitiated. He defined the Gospel in a limited way when he described the beginning of the ministry of Jesus: "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel' " (1:14, 15). The "gospel of God" and the "kingdom of God" are set in noteworthy parallelism. Perhaps

1 Frederick C. Grant, *The Earliest Gospel* (New York, 1943), pp. 148 ff.

this is a clue to Mark's interest in writing and in his convictions as a follower of Christ. He must have had in mind the long-awaited hope of the Jews that God would some day bring to pass his rule upon earth. Perhaps it should not be so surprising, then, that Mark has recorded a "little apocalypse," compressing therein a summary of the portents, signs, and magnificent powers set to usher in the hitherto slightly known or understood kingship of the holy and just God. Mark firmly believed that a new dispensation was coming which would controvert and render useless all former modes of his rule: the temple, mighty deliverers, or clever schemes. He could not but believe that suffering, perverse evil (the Antichrist), or delay would have a purpose and meaning in the light of that which was about to come to pass. And Christ, the Son of Man, would prove the glorious victor after all. It was as simple as that. It was to be something of which all would be aware (1:38). It was a word from God (2:2). Jesus was the agent (5:20). His disciples were to spread the news (6:12; cf. 14:9a) even though it meant sacrifice (10:29) and persecution (13:9). The kingdom was imminent: "Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God come with power" (9:1; cf. 14:25). The coming of the kingdom would not be gradual or open to observation (4:26-29); nor would its growth on earth be capable of measurement (4:31). Maturity, riches, or goodness—these in themselves were no guarantee of entrance (10:14, 23; 12:34). God alone was capable of admitting and qualifying those to be selected. People had opportunity in the interval to be readied for that day when the kingdom should come. They were to "repent and believe the gospel."

This was the *kerygma* of Mark. The *kairos* had been fulfilled. All time was now relative to the great coming event; and at the center of that event stood the Son of Man whom Mark set out to describe: Jesus Christ, Son of God, who came "not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many" (10:45). It is more a good news about Jesus Christ than of Jesus Christ. Were we to remove what is said of him we would remove the very essence of all that Mark left us. To say that Jesus is not essential to the event Mark records is to leave a husk without a kernel. This may not be true in the other Gospels as much as here.

It has been a problem for critical scholarship to note that Mark

records two feedings of the multitude in a work which is otherwise so compressed and concise. It is generally concluded that here we have a doublet which had developed out of one incident but which, by the time Mark wrote, had become accepted as two distinct but related episodes. Be that as it may, it should be obvious that for Mark this event had added meaning *because* it had been duplicated. Jesus is made to ask, "Why do you discuss the fact that you have no bread?" Both feedings and the details of each are recalled, and then he asks again, "Do you not yet understand?"

Jesus, in his person, was the answer to Mark's questions about the kingdom. He was the content of the *kerygma,* the mover of his faith, the retainer of his hope. Perhaps this explains the ending of Mark too. It would have been enough for Mark to be able to tell of Jesus' life. His resurrection would speak for itself (a fact which John makes explicit). Perhaps there was reason for being afraid to tell more of the implications of this. Perhaps, already, this was the "secret" of the Christian community, the "mystery" which made Christians unique, the initiatory revelation which needed to be guarded against the jealousies of a frantic emperor and the suspicion of an unsympathetic empire. Perhaps this was the most convincing indictment which Jews could make against them, a thing not wisely told except to eyes which were ready to see and ears ready to hear.

Might this explain also another unique characteristic of Mark, his "little apocalypse," chapter 13? An apocalypse was meant to conceal behind symbolic terms the convictions and implications of faith. Whereas it would have been enigmatic to enumerate in detail by way of recollection the appearances of Jesus, and whereas the idea of ascension would remove to a distance the scene Mark was so anxious to have hovering above the heads of his readers, a relevant apocalypse could explain the various problems faced in the turmoil of Christian life in times of persecution. It brought into immediate focus the implications of the ministry of our Lord: "heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away" (13:31). The Lord is away on a journey, he has put his servants in charge, and at all times the command is to be watchful. In times less turbulent, when the immediate circumstances of writing were unknown, it was thought strange that Mark did not properly end his work with a record of appearances like those of other gospels, incorporating the dearly loved and fondly re-

membered traditions of the church; or, knowing the reason for this great omission, the elders of the first church where Mark's Gospel found a repository and where the reasons for the omission were understood authorized its completion before sending it forth into the world.

However true it is that Mark says little of Jesus' appearances after death, there is little he leaves unsaid of his appearance in Palestine. Mark omits, perhaps, much of what our Lord said (he is not a man of letters), but Mark is an artist of a kind, for he paints before our eyes in vivid detail, in glimpses of effective background, and in memorable hues the One who bears in his person the impression of the gospel Mark would convey.

There was not much of conscious jealousy or hidden concern that this Jesus could be overshadowed by any figure, however formidable. John the Baptist was a herald of his coming. What John preached was essentially the same as is recorded of Jesus' message, but his aim was to point the way to the "beloved Son" who was addressed from heaven (1:11), who was, by comparison, awesome in greatness and holiness even to John (1:7), and who would administer a sacrament not in symbolism but in reality (1:8). John the Baptist was held in high esteem, as the question of Jesus revealed, "Was the baptism of John from heaven or from men?" (11:30). But it is inferred everywhere that John's message was but a substructure for the pulpit which honored the Christ.

The person of Jesus takes the place of Jesus' own teaching about the kingdom of God, as Professor Grant notes. There is no title which Mark withholds from Jesus. "Christ" is already a proper name for him (1:1; 15:32). It was fixed in the realization and confession of Peter (8:17-30). "Son of God," while no doubt omitted from the original manuscript in the opening verse, fittingly describes the picture Mark would paint throughout his Gospel (15:39). The demoniacs are mysteriously aware of the secret hid from the disciples' eyes: for them Jesus is "the Holy One of God" (1:24) and "Son of the Most High God" (5:7). But the title which is Mark's favorite is "Son of Man." This title is also most illusive in meaning. While I am aware of its different meanings in the Old Testament, it seems to me that Mark had a particular fondness for its use because, by its nature, it fitted so well the purpose and style of his work. Mark's Gospel is in the form of apocalyptic. Its real meaning was "hidden," a "Mystery," a "secret,"

and its greatest hidden secret was the mystery which centered in Jesus Christ. It is my contention, therefore, that Mark's primary association with the title "Son of Man" was the figure of Daniel 7:13 where its symbolism reflected the "kingdom of the 'saints of the Most High,' "[2] but more especially as that title had been interpreted in the intertestamental period by apocalyptic writers. There the phrase had reference to a supernatural, pre-existent man from heaven, an "anointed," "elect," and "righteous one," the agent and representative of God.[3] The title was sufficiently enigmatic to retain the secrets Mark used to explain the mysteries of Jesus' life, ministry, and eventual death. But the title was equally suggestive of meanings already known. It would serve to describe the self-designation of Jesus while at the same time hiding it (13:26, 27).

However, we must not forget other meanings of the phrase "Son of Man." Commentators are right in asserting that in some places "Son of Man" means only "man" or "mankind," and this in the words of Jesus himself. For Mark, Jesus was a man in every sense of the word. And for precisely that reason Jesus, the man, was most ideally suited to "give his life as a ransom for man." The prophecies of his death make this abundantly apparent (8:31 ff.; 9:30-32; 10:32-34; 14:8). He was most ideally suited for sacrifice. He was the best representative man could place in his stead. His life would certainly meet the price of redemption.

Jesus was not primarily a teacher for Mark. He was a wonder-worker, a healer, and an exorcist. Jesus was described by his acts. Where he did exercise the office of teacher, many times Mark recorded the words that were a demonstration of the nature of his own person. While it would be needless to describe in detail the familiar miracles of healing performed by Jesus according to this Gospel, it is easy to recall at a glimpse the limitless power Mark ascribed to him. Every type of bodily infirmity was cured. Fever was relieved (1:30); lepers (1:40), paralytics (2:3-11), cripples (3:1-6), and the diseased (3:10) found help; the dead were raised (5:22-43). Wherever he came people were made whole by the touch of his garments (6:53-56). The deaf and dumb (7:31-37) and the blind (8:22-26) experienced his miraculous power to restore. Unclean spirits and demons of every kind could

2 A. E. J. Rawlinson, *St. Mark* (London, 1949), p. liv.
3 Ibid.

not withstand his power or tolerate his presence (1:26, 39; 3:11; 5:1-20; 6:13; 7:24-31; 9:14-29). Jesus fed the multitudes (6:35-44; 8:1-10), and he walked on the sea (6:45-52).

"What is this? A new teaching!" the people exclaimed in amazement. Mark was quick to change the "What" to "Who." "He commands even the unclean spirits and they obey him" (1:27b); yes, "even wind and sea obey" (4:35-41). It is significant because here, in a person, was the sure, immediate, direct source of God's power; and this power was an implication of divine authority, even for the forgiveness of sins (2:10).

The implications were plenteous with reminders for the present, the situation and life of Mark's readers. They could be related to Jesus and were in no way of inferior status: "Whoever does the will of God is my mother, and sister, and brother" (3:31-35). Their faith could be operative now as then: "your faith has made you well" (10:52). The most perplexing of problems, life's greatest tragedies, were not without an answer which even superseded the presence of Jesus: "this kind cannot be driven out by anything but prayer" (9:14-29). His presence could still be known and experienced by an imitation of his acts: "whoever receives one such child in my name receives me; and whoever receives me, receives not me but him who sent me" (9:27).

Christology is Mark's main emphasis. I am reluctant to dismiss the subject in so brief a perusal of the data, but I shall dwell on related material as I continue to mark the characteristics of this work, especially when I deal with the writer's conception of discipleship.

Demons, spirits, angels, and Satan occupy, for our purposes, the same strata of terminology, reflecting as they do the common reasoning of the time. These were a part of the "supernatural" world that was striving for mastery over men. This world was to be ordered and become subordinate to the rule of the kingdom. As a matter of fact, it was the mastery of these elements which set the Lord in his place of authority. Demons were the evil spirits that deranged the mind, convulsed the body, and gripped the limbs and organs in vice-like power. Angels were the messengers of God who comforted, guarded, directed, and led according to the will, direction, and command of God. Satan, for Mark, was the diabolic figure, much like the tempter of Job. He stood for the legions of unrighteousness which were at work in the world. He had a metaphysical reality, but this was not made a

subject of speculation, at least not to the Hebrew mind. Satan's embodied force was not questioned. The possible existence of a metaphysical duality was not a problem for the ancients as it is for us. Mark was confident that his power, though real, was quite helpless in the presence of the Holy One of the Most High God. Satan and his forces were made to bear responsibility for much of the evil in the world. Our modern reflection would view this as naive, but there is no doubt that the ancients were grappling with profound subjects, still not explicable to us. Perhaps the causes of evil are not so mechanical as we have supposed. Perhaps the corporate spirits both of good and evil have much more authority than we are able to acknowledge. I am convinced that future studies in human and social dynamics will wish to borrow biblical terminology to describe new concepts, insights, forces, and limitations from a scientific point of view.

Mark utilizes the sources that ascribe evil to the personal forces which may be embodied in but have their identity apart from the affected individual. He does not abandon the thought of personal responsibility and involvement, however. The whole idea of repentance as a preparation for the kingdom underscores man's lack of obedient service in doing, in thinking, and in being good. "For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, fornication, theft, murder, adultery, coveting, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, foolishness. All these evil things come from within, and they defile the man" (7:21-23). Discipleship involved the struggle against these defilements, destructive as they are of the purity, usefulness, and resourcefulness of man.

The "evil things" were no doubt the backdrop before which the preaching of repentance was staged. There is too much that is not supplied in Mark's account to give us a definitive view of his conception of repentance. There are clues. John preached a baptism of repentance "for the forgiveness of sins" (1:4), a baptism preparatory to the coming of the kingdom; and Jesus preached that "the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel" (1:14). It would seem that Jesus takes up where John leaves off. This is what must have been meant in the words, "I baptize you with water; but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit" (1:8). In other words, Mark believed in the immediacy of the coming kingdom. To him, Jesus was implementing the initial movement by which the kingdom was to arrive in force.

He was supplying the spirit, the dynamic which was part of its present nature. This involved "conversion," a "baptism of the Holy Spirit," a life of discipleship, a living and expressive faith, a yielding to the dictates of the Spirit, to the stringent requirements, to sacrifice, and to a life lived in the consciousness of the kingdom's proximate supreme mastery of the world. Discipleship meant a willing abandonment of all claim on worldly goods (10:21, 28-31); it involved a child-like receptivity and trust (10:14); it presupposed the standards of the decalogue (12:34); it did not yield to a sense of abandonment in the face of suffering and persecution (10:23); it meant loyal and devoted service in accord with Jesus' own dedication of his life (10:42-45). It meant that everything—life, goods, family, friends, and position—was to be put on the plane of faith in God and in the authority of Jesus Christ, the apocalyptic Son of Man.

Faith, for Mark, was the equivalent of implicit trust. Faith, implicit and firm trust, was the condition for the forgiveness of sins (2:5). It overcame the intense fear of storm in our human predicament (4:40). The healing of disease, wholeness of body, came to the one who so trusted (5:34). In the face of death it was the key answer (5:36). Nothing was impossible when a man believed (9:23). Immovable mountains, unyielding obstacles, necessities of the mind and body could not remain in their fixed places of annoyance and perverse enmity when faith in God pervaded the situation (11:22-24).

Faith and prayer were closely linked in Mark's thought and in his remembrances taken from Jesus' ministry and teaching. Faith and prayer were also linked to any effective ministry of his disciples. Prayer was a means of preparation and strengthening in the exercise of faith (1:35). In types of healing where one's own faith could not be measured as adequate, prayer became the resource (9:29). A house of worship was essentially a house for prayer (11:17). The temptation to forsake faith and loyal discipleship was to be overcome in prayer (14:38). Indeed, a bound which prayer was unable to surpass did not exist. It could supply any need (11:24). Prayer presupposed the essential oneness of spirit which the disciple shared by the grace of God (11:25).

Discipleship did not necessarily mean a departure from Mosaic legislation or rabbinical teachings. It disagreed rather with the interpretations of the law which prevented its consummate fulfillment. Jesus

instructed the leper who was healed to offer the customary sacrifice (1:4). That this was done as a means of publicizing Jesus' ministry could not be maintained by Mark in view of commands of silence elsewhere. Rather it must have meant, for Mark, an open declaration of his respect for customs of life and worship. The sabbath was still a day to be honored as God's institution, but requirements customarily imposed on that day were not always in accord with its essential significance (2:23-28; 3:4). Jesus cited instances in which a commandment of God was ignored in favor of a superimposed religious rite (7:1-13). Jesus' words, "There is nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him" (7:15), were no doubt paralleled in the sayings of the rabbis for generations preceding his ministry. This is true, too, of his view of marriage (10:2-10). Jesus observed the Passover feasts (14:12 ff.). He maintained the practice of fasting (2:18-22), at least indirectly. Indeed, there were very few essentially new teachings prescribed for the life of his followers. This is a fact of noteworthy significance in any study of the Gospels, a fact which has been ignored or summarily treated by many scholars. The real interest and contribution of Mark, especially, but also of the other Gospels, was not that a new teaching had been found and presented, not that a highly excelling sect of Jewish religionists had arrived on a higher plane of inner certainty or favor, but that Jesus of Nazareth, the teacher-prophet and the itinerant evangelist, was the Christ, Son of God, apocalyptic Son of Man, fulfiller of the religion of the Old Testament and of the hopes of Israel. It is hardly conceivable that Jesus' teachings were the sole cause of such stupendous claims, for we can find most of his teachings in antecedent Jewish history and literature. What was essentially new was the person of Jesus. Mark certainly attests to this. And most of his evidence is based on Jesus' own inner certitude and conviction that he was to undergo suffering and death, and this experience and its aftermath were to have messianic significance. In at least five places Mark records Jesus' specific and concrete utterances to that effect (8:31 ff., 9:30-32; 10:32-34; 14:6-9; 10:38). I cannot conceive that these words were simply read back into the mouth of Jesus, that they were pure fabrications which served to relieve the embarrassment or shock of Jesus' apparent failure. It is true that the words of a deceased individual become acutely vivid in remembrance and that every recent word is interpreted

in the light of the approaching death. It is therefore probable that broad principles defining life and death and man's attitude and involvements in the same were taken from the mouth of Jesus and made to express, specifically, the coming tragedy. The miracle remains, however, for Jesus' life so perfectly demonstrated all that he taught both of life and death that the predictive element in his teaching was proved. While he knew the truth of what he said, it would be humanly instinctive to hide behind the enigmatic title "Son of Man" and hope that somehow it would not apply to himself. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me" is a statement of despair that conceals a testament of trust and hope (cf. Ps. 22), but it does not hide the plaintive distress of its subject who faces the reality of death.

The distinctive feature of discipleship, therefore, is its association with the person of Jesus; and after his death the most intimate disciple was an associate in his passion. "Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?" (10:38)—this was the test of discipleship, and it was sealed in a covenantal rite (14:22-25).

It has been my impression in this brief analysis that Mark is quite thoroughly imbued with the principles of apocalyptic literature and thought. It is only natural that this emphasis should be accompanied by eschatological considerations. But it is also my contention that the apocalyptic mode of presentation was necessitated partly by the persecution that Christians were enduring—persecution which included general suspicion, examination of written documents, scrutiny of what was said, and guesses as to the meaning of silence on their part. It is difficult to ascertain, therefore, what in Mark is a true reminiscence and account of Jesus' words and what is an interpretation and elaboration of the significance of his teachings for the immediate circumstance. This is particularly true in the eschatological passages.

Take for example the passage from the generally difficult chapter, the so-called Little Apocalypse: "But when you see the desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be (let the reader understand) then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains" (13:14-15). Understood in its setting, especially in reference to verses 9-13, which give instruction on what to do in times of trial, these verses need not describe the destruction of Jerusalem only, regardless of verse 2. After all, these were words applicable to a situation in Judea which

took place long before Jesus' ministry. This may simply be Mark's way of saying, "When the rulers [emperor?] set themselves in the place of God, then the end is imminent!" So taken, we can almost see Nero seated in his imperial palace giving instructions for the slaughter of Christians in Rome, particularly the leaders, which may have included a Paul or a Peter! "That is no time to take thought for yourself," writes Mark. "That is a time to remain firm in your conviction. The advent of the Son of Man is upon you. The completion of all things is at hand." The elect were forewarned of the worst kind of calamity (13:23), but they were also to remember that such tragedies were to be short-lived (13:20).

The stress under which believers lived brought to the fore the need of encouragement. Rewards were considered forthcoming: houses, brothers, sisters, mothers, and children and lands in this time; and, at last, eternal life (10:30). Even the most humble Christian could have the greatest anticipation: "But many that are first will be last, and the last first" (10:31). There is reward commensurate with the smallest act of sacrifice (9:41); and there is condemnation for the most subtle deceit and selfishness (12:40). To be ashamed of the Christian confession now is to be the object of shame in the day of the Son of Man (8:38). There are those who can expect to live to see the power of the coming kingdom in full force (9:1). Hatred and derision are to be expected, but these are a test of endurance, and endurance means salvation for the elect wherever they are (13:13, 27).

Mark's use of apocalyptic imagery and eschatological terminology was sufficient to convince his readers of the certainty of resurrection. Jesus made this explicit, however (12:18-27). Herod suggested its possibility (6:14). And Jesus' prophecy of his own resurrection excludes whatever reservations might have been held. For Mark the resurrection of Jesus was a "theological" necessity, and the resurrection of believers and unbelievers was a judicial certainty.

These are avenues of suggested thought and implicit theology in Mark. Mark does not go far beyond this. In this respect he cannot be likened to Matthew, who is anxious to interpret and set in topical order every avenue of thought approached by Jesus. Nor does he reflect the scholarly and objective pursuit of Luke, who wished to claim every grain of tradition which he could reasonably be expected to include in his narrative without distorting the facts. Mark is a

simple believer of the first century, content to put the most profound construction and implication upon the words and acts of his Lord without thinking it necessary to expound or explain either. He met the situation that he and his readers faced in the calm but convinced assertion that Christ, the Son of Man—Jesus, Son of God—was equal to the task—rather, infinitely above it, the master of it.

To be gripped with the persuasion of Mark is to experience the meaning of faith in its first beginnings. To grasp some of the power of it is to gain mastery over some of the inexplicable perplexities and contradictions in it. We cannot rightly comprehend Mark unless we let ourselves live in the framework of his time, his environment, and his mental and religious orientation; nor can we transport his emphasis into our present setting without distorting the essence of the Gospel he portrayed. But that is not to say that he failed to convey what will be of lasting import to every generation. In his simple and direct way he brought his readers to an empty tomb, and though they were afraid to tell anyone, they could see in the imagery that brought them there the figure that was to go before them into Galilee, into Rome, and into the uttermost parts of the world.

Toward an Evangelical Understanding of the Lutheran Confessions

By Lowell C. Green

WHAT place should be accorded the writings of the Book of Concord in American Lutheranism? This has again become a vital concern. A wave of protest arose in circles not only of the present American Lutheran Church (ALC) but also of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (ELC) when the tentative constitution for the future merger, "The American Lutheran Church" (TALC), first appeared in 1956. As a result of official "grass roots" discussions, two ALC district conventions forwarded resolutions requesting changes in Article IV of the proposed constitution, entitled "Confession." Objections pointed out an ambiguity in the form of subscription to certain symbols and the use of legalistic terminology to express acceptance. The former was regarded as sectarian and the latter as unevangelical and therefore un-Lutheran.

The problem was discussed on an intersynodical basis at a free theological retreat held at Aberdeen, S. D., on November 26-28, 1956. In an unusually thorough ventilation of the subject, various aspects were presented by Prof. Herman A. Preus (ELC), the Rev. T. R. Baudler (ALC), and seven other speakers, including two district presidents. The result was a fine understanding among representatives present from the ALC, ELC, and Suomi Synod. (The United Evangelical Lutheran Church, UELC, was not represented at this meeting.) The group voted unanimously to issue the following statement, which was then published in the church papers:

> Article IV, Sections 2 and 3, of the Constitution, contained in the *Report of the Joint Union Committee,* 1956, should be revised so that all the Confessions of the Book of Concord (three ecumenical creeds, the Augsburg Confession and Apology, Luther's Large and Small Catechisms, Smalcald Articles, and Formula of Concord) be accepted on an equal basis. . . . This Article as presently stated is ambiguous and inconsistent with historical development.[1]

1 *Lutheran Herald,* Vol. XLI, No. 2, p. 38. Published in altered form also in *The Lutheran Standard,* Vol. CXIV, No. 52, p. 6.

What became of these communications? The ALC district resolutions never reached the floor of the October, 1956, synodical convention at Blue Island, Ill. District delegates were approached at Blue Island with the request not to bring the doctrinal statement into debate at the convention. It was opined that the cause would be given adequate consideration by the Joint Union Committee (JUC) if the matter were brought to the committee directly. If the advice was given in good faith, the result was nevertheless unfortunate. The ALC convention adopted the Report of the JUC without a debate on the confessional paragraph. And since none of the synods involved in the merger had brought questions from their church conventions requesting a change in confessional subscription, the JUC felt reluctant to make changes in the text. In spite of the fact that in other cases the JUC made modifications, it decided at its meeting in Columbus, Ohio, on January 24-25, 1957, to reaffirm its position on the Confessions. "Without a dissenting vote the JUC resolved to make no change in the language or arrangement of this article," it was reported.[2]

Some observers have predicted that the new TALC would carry out its organizing along the lines of proverbial Scandinavian level-headedness in practical matters and characteristic German thoroughness in theological problems. However, that did not happen at this crucial point. For a confessional platform is basic, and the proposed platform is a compromise in which the German tradition has been largely sacrificed.[3] It might appear as though the ALC was simply overpowered by the ELC, UELC, and Lutheran Free Church.[4] On second thought, however, this will seem to be incorrect. The following considerations must be borne in mind. (1) Many of the Scandinavians are fully loyal to all the Lutheran Confessions, as was shown at the Aberdeen meeting, where the initiative in preparing the statement was taken by ELC pastors. (2) A large part of the present ELC comes from the former Norwegian Synod, which unequivocally subscribed the whole Book of Concord as a member of the Synodical Conference. (3) At the same time, many leaders and theologians of

2 *Lutheran Standard,* Vol. CXV, No. 7, p. 5.

3 Editor O. G. Malmin, a member of the JUC, admits that the committee "adopted the practice of the bodies which are of Scandinavian origin." *Lutheran Herald,* XLI, No. 2, p. 32.

4 The Lutheran Free Church is no longer participating. The Suomi Synod, which is said to have a confessional basis practically the same as that of the ALC, is deciding whether to join in this union of the ELC, ALC, and UELC during the summer of 1957.

German background do not seem to be strongly concerned about confessional issues. (4) To our knowledge, the confessional problem, in its relation to the present merger, has never been subjected to a thorough review in a general theological forum. The over-burdened members of the JUC have apparently not had the benefit of a basic two-way discussion on this subject with representative thinkers from the parish ministry and theological professors.

Such a discussion could be of great value. The possibilities in this sort of encounter were seen at Aberdeen in November. We add that theological discussions ought to be carried on in an objective manner. Nothing is gained by making bitter statements against persons, nor does heat facilitate clear thinking. At the same time, the right of all positions to be heard must be maintained. Those who wish to work toward an acceptable confessional paragraph for TALC should not be dismissed on grounds that they are reactionaries, that they are "suspicious" of others, or that they lack trust in their leaders. In America we say that we believe in the democratic way; even the parish minister might venture to make his contribution, and should be listened to. Nor can theological and religious matters always be decided by counting heads. Such a criterion proved unreliable in the days of Pontius Pilate, Athanasius, Martin Luther, and Charles Porterfield Krauth. Instead, the thoughts presented must be studied carefully in the light of God's Word within the perspective of the history of the church.

Analysis and Critique of the Report of the JUC

The text of the controversial Article IV runs as follows:

"Section 1. The American Lutheran Church accepts all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as a whole and in all their parts as the divinely inspired, revealed, and *inerrant* Word of God, and submits to this as the only infallible authority in all matters of faith and life.

"Section 2. As brief and true statements of the doctrines of the Word of God, the Church accepts and confesses the following Symbols, subscription to which shall be *required* of all its members, both *congregations* and *individuals*:

(1) The ancient ecumenical Creeds: the Apostolic, the Nicene, and the Athanasian;

(2) The Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism.

"Section 3. As further *elaboration of* and *in accord* with *these Lutheran Symbols,* the Church also *receives* the other *documents* in the Book of Concord of 1580: the Apology, Luther's Large Catechism, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord; and recognizes them as *normative for its theology.*

"Section 4. The American Lutheran Church accepts without reservation the symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, not in so far as but because they are the presentation and explanation of the pure doctrine of the Word of God and a summary of the faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."[5]

It is not our desire to comment on Sec. 1 in the present essay. The symbols listed in Sec. 2 represent the total confessional platform of the present ELC; here they seem to constitute a category of "major" confessions. Subscription to these shall be *required* in TALC. The Confessions that are called merely *documents* in Sec. 3 are the remaining symbols of the ALC; apparently as "minor" symbols, they are merely *received* and relegated to the category of being *normative for theology.*[6] Unexpectedly, Sec. 4 "accepts without reservation" the

5 Taken from *Report of the Joint Union Committee to the Conventions of the Negotiating Bodies, 1956,* p. 20. The italics are mine.

6 Why the Norwegians (and Danes) have never fully accepted the other Confessions requires some explanation. Their non-subscription goes back to an application by Frederick II, king of Denmark-Norway, of the undemocratic rule, *Cujus regio, ejus religio.* His theological counselor was Nils Hemmingsen, who had come back from studies at Wittenberg as a Crypto-Calvinist. In 1580 Frederick II received a copy of the Book of Concord. As the story is told by Norwegian historians, the king angrily refused to study the book but threw it into the fire. He then wrote all bishops, forbidding the use of the book. Pastors and professors who owned it were liable to dismissal. Book-dealers vending it were, if caught, subject to the death penalty. Is this the way theological problems should be handled? Need this precedent, established by the Danish king, lead to sacrificing the tradition of the ALC? The argument that these other Confessions (Sec. 3) were not a part of Norwegian and Danish development does not settle anything in the present merger discussion. (1) Neither did the Augsburg Confession and Small Catechism come from Scandinavia. (2) The authority of Confessions is their witness to the Word of God. (3) All the Confessions are a part of the ALC heritage. Many of her early leaders (cf. Buffalo Synod history) and founders of present congregations had been persecuted in Europe because of their loyalty to these same Confessions and founded congregations now belonging to the ALC where these symbols were to have full recognition. Shall their sacrifices be forgotten? (4) Many ALC pastors, who were ordained explicitly on the basis of all the symbols, will experience injury to conscience. (5) All ALC congregations which have adopted the recommended local constitution explicitly subscribe all the Confessions. Shall the synodical constitution do less? (6) Ought not the projected merger take what is best from each synod, striving for enrichment rather than impoverishment?

Lutheran symbols ". . . because they are the presentation and explanation of the pure doctrine of the Word of God." An interpretation of the JUC at its Jan. 24-25, 1957, meeting stated that all the Lutheran symbols of the Book of Concord were really meant even if this is not stated in Sec. 4. Why not then insert this interpretation in Sec. 4? Implicit faith was made irrelevant to Lutheran theology by Philip Melanchthon in 1518!

We have before our eyes a confessional statement which is a real novelty. There are no parallels for it in American Lutheran history; the JUC has apparently been willing to dispense with the lessons from past history. Conceivably it will remain in force for many years. We should therefore have the right to expect answers to theological queries. The following come to mind at once.

1) Is not the confessional paragraph legalistic? To "require" such subscription suggests a negative attitude from the start. Could the phrase "normative for theology" lead to regarding the Confessions as a "paper pope" rather than as an evangelical witness?[7]

2) The article contains embarrassing historical inaccuracies. The symbols listed in Sec. 3 are called elaborations of those in Sec. 2. We ask: Is Luther's Large Catechism (1528-29) thereby made an elaboration of the Augsburg Confession of 1530? Does the JUC wish to make the Large Catechism an elaboration of the Small?[8]

3) What does the JUC mean in Sec. 3 with the phrase "these Lutheran symbols?" Grammatically, it would appear that all the symbols listed in Sec. 2 were intended. How can this apply to the ancient creeds? Have they ceased to be "general" creeds and, through an enactment of the JUC, been made into "particular" creeds? If not, intolerable difficulties appear. In that case, are the Confessions named in Sec. 3 meant to agree with the Augsburg Confession and the Small Catechism but not to be "elaborations of" and "in accord with" the

7 Neither phrase has precedent in American Lutheranism. The phrase "normative for theology" has apparently never been used before, the word "normative" being unusual as well. The word "require" appears in none of the constitutions examined from the old General Synod, General Council, United Synod South, Ohio Synod, Iowa Synod, Buffalo Synod, Texas Synod, ALC, ELC, or churches of the Synodical Conference. Why this innovation?

8 In this involved problem the implication of the JUC that the Large was derived from the Small Catechism would appear untenable. See Michael Reu, *Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism: A History of Its Origin* (Chicago, 1929). Cf. introduction in *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (Göttingen, 1930), pp. xxviii ff. See also the introduction of Clemen in his Luther edition, Vol. 4.

three creeds? Are then "these Lutheran symbols" at variance with the ecumenical creeds? Yet the Apology, Smalcald Articles, and Formula of Concord seek to show that Lutheranism follows the ecumenical creeds while the Large Catechism even quotes the Apostles' Creed *in toto!* Should not the JUC clarify its position here?

4) Has the JUC considered carefully the implications when in Sec. 3 it is stated that those Confessions are "received" because they agree with the symbols in Sec. 2? Such an idea places tradition where the Word of God ought to be supreme. Symbols are derived not from symbols but from the Word of God. The first sentence of the Formula of Concord contradicts this theory of the JUC in Sec. 3 with the familiar words: "The sole rule and standard according to which all dogmas together with all teachers should be . . . judged is the . . . Scriptures. . . ." A few lines further on it is confessed: "The other symbols . . . are not judges, as are the Holy Scriptures. . . ."

5) Is it safe to disregard lessons from church history? Some of the ancestors of the ALC, especially in the Ohio Synod, underwent great difficulties in overcoming weak confessional standards, conquering unionism, and achieving a strong position regarding the Confessions. At an early Ohio Synod convention a Methodist preacher delivered the Communion sermon; a "model constitution" recommended to Ohio Synod congregations by the Synod in 1833 permitted non-Lutheran ministers to serve if they could show proof of belonging to the ministerium of some Reformed denomination. By the grace of God the ALC has come from there to a full recognition of the Lutheran Confessions, expressed in evangelical terms. Does the JUC want to make history repeat itself? Article IV seems to take us back to 1837.[9]

6) A number of words and phrases in Article IV are ambiguous. What is meant by "receives" in Sec. 3? Only in archaic English does it commonly signify "accepts." Why are the Apology, the Large Catechism, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord called "documents" while the other Confessions are called symbols"? What is meant by the word "normative"? Should not the article be so formulated as to be straightforward, clear, and free of all ambiguities

9 Pertinent document in Otto Kraushaar, *Verfassungsformen der Lutherischen Kirche Amerikas* (Gütersloh, 1911), pp. 91 ff.

that might in the future lead to misunderstandings or doctrinal deviations?

Perils of a Legalistic Approach to the Confessions

For many people a discussion of the confessional problem becomes an emotional experience before it is begun. The Confessions are thought by some to be the resources only of quarrelsome individuals, and so it were best to avoid discussions with those who seem to be interested in the Book of Concord. Unfortunately, past history would seem to support this prejudice. But this is an unjust attitude toward the Confessions. They were intended to further peace and concord. If the Lutheran symbols serve no better purpose than to commend one's opponent to "the God of truth, who is the enemy and judge of all lies and falsehoods," there would of course be no room for them within an evangelical ethos. They should not be misused in condemning others.[10] How much better if the Confessions had been allowed to remain witnesses of the Gospel. Theological disputes had better be settled on the basis of fresh study in the Word. Too often the Confessions have been given an *a priori* approach and application. The result has been that they have come to occupy a false, legalistic position. Strangely enough, this usage, which stands in diametric opposition to the self-witness of these symbols, has often been employed on the part of those who were considered the most loyal defenders and competent interpreters of the Book of Concord!

It is this mistaken application that seems to underlie the phrase employed by the JUC, "normative for theology." It may be assumed that this phrase was intended to refer back to a teaching held by some of the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century. The attempt to call the Confessions *norms* is opposed by the Formula of Concord, which says that the Holy Scriptures alone are the *unica norma*. But in true scholastic spirit several of the old dogmaticians had to analyze this statement, dividing it into sub-categories. The Bible was called

10 Thus wrote Prof. Schmidt about his colleagues in the Iowa Synod. He declared: "The talent of the men of Iowa for glossing themselves over is without an equal. The Jesuit fathers should seek training from them, for their principle is well known to be the same: *si fecisti, nega!*" *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Vol. I, No. 3, pp. 120, 126. In the light of eighty years of subsequent history, it would appear that the Fritschel brothers were much closer to an evangelical interpretation of the Confessions than was Schmidt, even though their phrase "open questions" was subject to misinterpretation.

the *norma normans,* the primary norm, and the Lutheran symbols were styled the *norma normata,* the derived or secondary norms. Such a distinction is subject to question, but the stress seems to have been on the word *normata* rather than on *norma,* thus emphasizing the primacy of the Scriptures. Hence they did not consider the Confessions to be "normative for theology" when they termed them the *norma normata.* It was Leonhard Hutter (1563-1616) who asserted the inspiration of the Lutheran Confessions. This position, which met wide opposition from other Lutheran scholars of his time and later, led him into various logical difficulties. He was forced to help himself by qualifying this inspiration, *quatenus nimirum cum scripturis consentiunt,* "insofar as they agree (beyond a doubt) with Scriptures." But Hutter had weakened rather than strengthened the position of the Lutheran Confessions; his use of the word *quatenus* was to find sinister echoes in years to come.[11]

It has been shown before that a *quatenus* subscription ("insofar as" symbols accord with the Word of God) is inadequate and meaningless, for even a Southern Baptist could cheerfully subscribe them on such a qualified basis! On the other hand, the JUC is to be applauded for having expressly aligned itself with the *quia* accent, accepting them "not in so far as but because" they agree with the Word of God. Nevertheless, the offensive *quatenus* qualification is in practice introduced into Sec. 3. To make the Confessions "normative for theology" introduces the logical supposition that this is possible only in so far as the Confessions named in Sec. 3 truly represent the Gospel. Thus, in spite of endeavors to avoid the word *quatenus* in Sec. 4, the application of that principle is for all practical purposes indispensable to Sec. 3.

How shall present and future generations interpret that exotic phrase, "normative for theology?" The word "normative" is not listed in the standard Merriman-Webster and Funk & Wagnalls desk dictionaries. In the New World Dictionary the word is listed with this definition: "of or establishing a norm, or standard." Does the JUC want to say that in TALC the Confessions listed in Sec. 3 (to the exclusion of those in Sec. 2?) shall be the norms for theological study? This presents formidable problems to the thoughtful theologian.

11 See F. H. R. Frank, *Die Theologie der Concordienforme* (Erlangen, 1858), Vol. I, pp. 31 f.

We may assume that the Confessions are to be norms either as to *form* or else as to *content*. Are they to be norms according to the *form* in which theological matters are discussed? Does this mean that in TALC theological professors and pastors will have to arrange their presentations according to the categories of the symbols? One can imagine the frustration of the Old Testament scholar at having to arrange his material under such headings as these: "Of the Sublime Articles Concerning the Divine Majesty." "Of the Mass." "Of Chapters and Cloisters." "Of the Papacy," etc. Perhaps the split personalities that result will enable TALC to use its enormous resources to establish schizophrenic wards for loyal Lutherans suffering severe guilt-complexes at being unable to arrange their findings according to the form of the Smalcald Articles or the Apology! Or are the Confessions not to be taken so seriously?

The other possibility is that the Confessions will be norms not according to form but according to *content*. Here we are faced with a still more serious dilemma. It has always been recognized that the Confessions must be studied ever anew to determine whether they are indeed in accord with the Holy Scriptures. This must be the personal investigation of every candidate of theology. If the Confessions are elevated to a position of norms, as in the proposed constitution for TALC, this circuit is closed, and the symbols become the subject instead of remaining the object of theological inquiry. Thereby the *sola scriptura* principle of the Reformation is lost. Tradition is reintroduced, as before the day of Luther and Melanchthon. While Luther can be excused for extravagantly saying that Melanchthon's *Loci communes* of 1521 were worthy of canonization, union committees today ought not to take upon themselves such prerogatives regarding the Confessions.

One gains the impression that the JUC feels that the Lutheran Confessions represent the end of theological development. Over against this common view it must be pointed out that symbols are not theological products in the same sense as contemporary productions. The Confessions are voices from the past. They are still valid as witnesses to the Gospel, but they do not speak out to many contemporary problems. This is the age of Dewey, Bultmann, and Tillich. Must our theology remain in the seventeenth century while the mainstream of Christian thought in this new age moves on without us?

An Evangelical Understanding of the Confessions

We can refer only briefly to the concept of "confession" in the New Testament. Confession is a vital concept in the Bible, being closely linked with the doctrine of justification. The common verb for confess is *homologein;* it is used in this sense sixteen times in the New Testament, besides *homologia, martyrein,* and other words expressing the idea. Jesus attached eschatological value to confessing one's faith in him, promising to confess such persons before God the Judge (Matt. 10:32-33, Luke 12:8, Mark 8:38, Luke 9:26). "Blessed art thou, Simon," said Jesus upon Peter's great confession, and Jesus thereupon assigned him the primacy among the apostles. St. Paul writes, "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10:10). Confessional formulas are in evidence in such places as Mark 8:29, Luke 9:20, John 6:69, 20:28, 20:31, Phil. 2:6-11, and Matt. 28:19, among others.

A word of caution must at once be injected. The Bible nowhere teaches that simply to recognize pure doctrine in itself constitutes saving faith. "Pure doctrine and right confessions are at best the fruits of faith, not that faith itself. These can as little justify before God as good works, and hence they do not guarantee that one is a child of God."[12] Confession that is made unto salvation is not a glib repetition of what somebody else said 400 or even 1,500 years ago, but it is rather the response of faith to the message of God's Word —in this case given in the words of ancient symbols in which he who confesses joins his individual voice to blend in the full choral response of faith of the church since ages past.

It is to be stressed that our Lutheran Confessions were written in the indicative rather than in the imperative. As early as 1524, the movement that led to the framing of the Augsburg Confession can be found among the young Lutheran churches of Franconia. The pastors or town councils of such municipalities as Nuremberg and Ansbach sent out questionnaires to find out what was actually being taught in the evangelical churches.[13] When the questionnaires were returned it was found that so remarkable an agreement existed that the Lu-

12 Werner Elert, *Das Christliche Ethos* (Tübingen, 1949), p. 465.

13 See "Die Ansbacher 40 Fragen 1528," "Die Ansbacher 30 Fragen 1528," and "Die Nürnberger 23 Frageartikel 1528" in the collection by Karl Schornbaum in *Die Fränkischen Bekenntnisse: eine Vorstufe der Augsburgischen Konfession* (Munich, 1930).

therans could speak with one voice. This consensus led directly into the opening sentence of the Augsburg Confession: "Our churches with common consent do teach. . . ." For them the series of statements was not some extraneous document to which they gave half-hearted assent for fear of losing their source of income, but it was rather a full-hearted confession for which they were ready to lay down their lives at Augsburg.

This is the evangelical approach to the Confessions. Translated into present-day conditions, it is an *a posteriori* rather than an *a priori* approach. It avoids legalism. We begin with the Holy Scriptures; then we examine the Confessions in the light of God's Word, only to discover that these are faithful witnesses of the Holy Writ. This was the experience of several great theologians of the past century as they emerged from Rationalism. How salutary if every candidate of theology today could speak in unison with the young Adolf von Harless of 1827: "After I had learned from the Scriptures what saving truth is, I turned to the symbolical books of my church. I cannot describe how surprised and how moved I was to discover that their content conformed with the convictions I had gained from the Scriptures and my experience of faith."[14] Gottfried Thomasius, another founder of the Erlangen school, said: "Thus we were Lutherans before we knew it. . . . Thus we became Lutheran without compulsion, from conviction."[15] But if the Lutheran symbols are to achieve that position today, they must be received as evangelical witnesses of the truth and not as legalistic strait-jackets restricted for the more serious theologian in the phrase "normative for theology."

In seeking an evangelical approach to the Confessions, it is necessary to avoid the shoals of a literalistic interpretation. One must distinguish between the doctrine itself which is being defined and the manner in which that doctrine is presented. The doctrine itself retains abiding authority because it is a witness to the Word of God, but the manner in which it is said does not possess the same significance.

The fact that the confessors of the sixteenth century expressed themselves in terms of the then current Aristotelian philosophy does

14 Quoted in Hermann Sasse, *Here We Stand*, tr. by T. G. Tappert (Minneapolis, 1946), pp. 171-172.

15 D. von Stählin, "Gottfried Thomasius," in *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd ed., Vol. XV, p. 626.

not obligate us to acknowledge the eternal infallibility of Aristotle any more than it excuses us from expressing that same faith in our contemporary world of thought. What is said in the Confessions will retain its authority, but how it is said is not binding. Not every proof passage isolated from the Bible, not every historical allusion, not every illustration employed by the Lutheran fathers may be meaningful for today. In fact, the possibility exists that some citation or example was incorrectly employed. We dare not overlook the fact that the science of textual criticism and exegesis, not to mention the vast progress made in the understanding of grammar and word meanings, especially since the study of the more recent papyri findings, has brought biblical theology much further than it had come in the days of the Reformers. In many ways the modern Luther scholar can arrive at a truer perspective of Luther than even the framers of the Formula of Concord possessed. Does this threaten the authority of the Confessions? Not at all. Or need it hamstring the theologian, obliging him either not to inquire further than the Confessions went or else to refrain from divulging what he has discovered? Not in the least. The Confessions are able to maintain themselves. But what is necessary is that we learn to distinguish between the dogma that is presented and the manner in which it is presented when the latter shows the limitations of the times.[16]

We are attempting to avoid legalism in our approach to the Confessions. But this raises a problem. If we permit such evangelical liberty in their interpretation, could it not be abused? Is there not the danger that someone would go so far as to declare an essential teaching to be merely an obsolete form of expression? Could not the essence be lost in a process analogous to demythologizing the New Testament? We must admit that the peril exists, but this risk must be taken unless Christian liberty is to be surrendered. The same peril surrounds exegesis of the Bible. There is in Lutheranism no authority competent

16 Friedrich Brunstäd spoke of distinguishing between the *Lehrgestalt* and the *Lehrintention*. The *Lehrintention* is that which is binding, not the *Lehrgestalt*. Brunstäd, *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften* (Gütersloh, 1951), pp. 9-10. Cf. Sigmund Fritschel, "The German Iowa Synod," in *The Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States* (Philadelphia, 1893), pp. 64-66. Fritschel's article is still contemporary.

to establish a legal criterion. This will remain true until Lutheranism returns to the authority of the pope![17]

How is arbitrariness to be avoided? Through proper theological training. Every clergyman must be competent to study the Confessions in the light of the Word of God. The theological curriculum must consciously aim toward this goal. The indispensable tools for such work are, over and above a familiarity with history and a grasp of logic and philosophy, a competence in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and German. Without languages theological study must depend upon secondary sources and become a process of spoon-feeding. Then the Confessions seem like irksome restraints. Only through a theological curriculum which takes seriously the need for enabling the student to come to know his sources at first hand can the Confessions come to life. And then he will be freed from many of his prejudices toward these symbols. Instead of breathing the stuffy air of a legalistic attitude toward the Book of Concord, he will be ushered into the exhilaratingly pure air of evangelical liberty, in which alone the Confessions can flourish. The future of Lutheran theology will depend upon this. Then the wish of the JUC to make these noble witnesses to the truth into norms of theology will vanish.

What Should Be the TALC Form of Subscription?

We have attempted to show that subscription to the symbols should and can be evangelical. It would theoretically be possible to leave it at this point: the Confessions should be held binding not by any regulations but by the fact that, finding them true and faithful witnesses and expositions of the doctrines of the Word of God, the individual feels inwardly compelled to affirm them and to conform his life and teaching to them. But we must face the fact that all is not well in this world. The world is full of sin, from which no one in the church is free. In his *Loci communes* of 1521 Melanchthon noted: "Insofar as we believe, we are free; insofar as we mistrust God, we

17 Franz Pieper objects lest the "subjective judgment" of the individual "decide how much of the symbols he will accept as 'historically occasioned,'" in his *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. I (St. Louis, 1950), p. 355. But it must be pointed out that the sanctified conscience of the individual interpreter cannot be eliminated lest the Lutheran Confessions lose their immediacy and suffer legalistic treatment.

are under the Law."[18] Or to use another analogy from Luther: while the believer is free from human government according to his liberty in Christ, he nevertheless surrenders the exercise of this freedom and subjects himself to human laws for the benefit of his neighbor.[19] Restraints are needed. In order to protect local congregations as well as the church at large from errors in doctrines and life, the Lutheran Church has established for her ministers, officials, and teachers the requirement that they conform to the teaching of the Lutheran Confessions. At the same time, the Confessions have proved themselves to be a valuable resource to guide in correct doctrine those entrusted with the practical affairs of the church.

Except for the churches of Norway and Denmark and the union churches of Germany, this has generally meant subscription to all the Lutheran symbols, as presented in the Book of Concord. Among the general bodies in the United States, full subscription is required in all the larger groups except the ELC. After the projected union to form TALC, American Lutheranism will be divided into three major conferences or general bodies. The two that have existed for some time, the Synodical Conference and the United Lutheran Church in America, possess confessional platforms in which all the Lutheran symbols are subscribed. If the recommendation of the JUC is allowed to set the pattern for the third general body, from the point of view of Symbolics *TALC will represent the left-wing of Lutheranism in America.* We fear that a fundamentalistic biblicism will lead the new body toward becoming a Lutheran sect.

The same anxiety was expressed by Prof. Emil W. Matzner, of Wartburg Seminary:

> The various documents comprising the Book of Concord were accepted by a decisive majority of the Lutheran churches and have come to be known historically as the Lutheran symbols. The making—and rescinding—of symbols is not the domain of a small group; and the proposed new American Lutheran Church, as well as those churches which have not accepted the entire Book of Concord, is only a minor fraction of the Lutheran Church in its entirety. By adopting the confessional sections in their proposed form the new American Lutheran Church

18 We quote from the edition of Hans Engelland in the new *Studienausgabe, Melanchthons Werke* (Gütersloh, 1952), Vol. II/1, p. 130.

19 See Luther's "Von weltlicher Obrigkeit" in *W. A.*, XI, pp. 250-253.

would in a sectarian way be taking a step backward historically and inviting controversy on a matter that had better be left settled.[20]

Thus, at a time when much stress is being laid upon ecumenical relations in the Lutheran World Federation (and even in the World Council of Churches), a large part of the Lutheran Church in America is being diverted from the main stream of confessional Lutheranism and the example of the major bodies in other countries.

How should the confessional paragraph of the proposed new church read? We venture to offer the following principles. (1) Historical traditions should be fully recognized as evidences of the leading of the Spirit of God, and that calls for a more serious evaluation of the position of the present ALC than has heretofore been given. (2) In view of the fact that the new body is to take her place in American and world Lutheranism, her confessional platform should be on an equal standing with the best. (3) This means that the Lutheran symbols should not be sorted into various categories but that all the writings of the Book of Concord should receive unqualified subscription in evangelical terminology. (4) The JUC is to be commended for having suggested subscription to the Confessions "not in so far as but because" they are in accord with the Word of God; but existing doubt should be removed by revising the wording to show that all the symbolical books were intended. Such an important interpretation should not remain in the minutes.

We propose the following confessional paragraph for TALC, in which we overlook Sec. 1 for the time being and replace Sec. 2, 3, and 4 with the following two sections:

Section 2. As true statements of the doctrines of the Word of God, the church accepts and confesses the following symbols: the ancient Creeds, namely, the Apostolic, the Nicene, and the Athanasian; the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and its Apology, the Large and Small Catechisms of Luther, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord.

Section 3. The American Lutheran Church accepts without reservation these symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, not in so far as but because they are the presentation and explanation of the pure doctrine of the Word of God and a summary of the faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

20 From Emil W. Matzner, letter to Alfred H. Ewald, ALC member of JUC, July 26, 1956.

This statement is almost identical with the proposal of Prof. Matzner; at the same time, it meets the objections and seeks to follow the suggestions made by the 1956 conventions of the Dakota and Iowa Districts of the ALC, besides the expressed opinions of other pastors and leaders of the ALC, ELC, and the Suomi Synod. It avoids legalism. It is fully historical. It is faithful to the tradition of the ALC. It would harmonize much better with the constitutions of congregations of the present ALC and would avoid doing violence to the consciences of pastors in the ALC who in their ordination vows pledged themselves to all the Lutheran Confessions. Still it does no violence to the position of the ELC, which indeed contains this statement in Chap. VII of its present constitution, regarding articles that cannot be amended: "This section shall not be construed so as to prevent inserting in Section 3 the remaining Lutheran symbols."

But a sound confessional paragraph will not be enough to insure the doctrinal purity of TALC. Together with proper subscription, further effort must be made that these principles of sound Lutheran doctrine be carried out not only on union committees but also in pastoral practice, in college and seminary classrooms, and in administrative circles. There must be adequate subscription, but this subscription dare not be confined to the constitution but must find expression in the teaching and life of the new church. This is also the concern of Dr. T. F. Gullixson, president-emeritus of Luther Seminary in St. Paul, who said: "The continuity of the Lutheran confessional principle as an influence in the world of men should be zealously safe-guarded and furthered."[21]

21 T. F. Gullixson, *The Fellowship Question* (Minneapolis, 1932), p. 50.

On a Preposition in the Nicene Creed

By Howard N. Bream

WHEN the average Lutheran reading the Nicene Creed comes to the words, "And I believe one holy Christian and Apostolic Church," he probably never notices the oddity of the wording. Just before that point he has recited, "I believe in one God, . . . and in one Lord Jesus Christ, . . . and I believe in the Holy Ghost. . . ." It is easy to miss the fact that the article concerning the church omits the preposition "in."

If the change is noticed, some might think it is due to a misprint. Or it might be credited to the peculiarities of ecclesiastical language. To a careful reader, the plain meaning of the phrase, "And I believe one holy Christian and Apostolic Church" would be that the church has stated something which the believer accepts. This is what we mean when we say to someone, "I believe you." Or it might be more indefinite, indicating that the believer gives assent to the church in whatever it has said or will say.

But a thoughtful analysis of the Creed easily shows how wrong this interpretation would be. Each of the four articles containing the verb "believe" (it is implied in the second article concerning Jesus Christ) is based upon the same logical pattern of expression: (1) The declaration of belief, (2) the name or title of the object of belief, (3) the content of the faith. In other words, the items in the third element qualify and give substance to the second element. Let us arrange the first article according to this pattern.

1) I believe in
2) God
3) who in the person of the Father is one, almighty, the maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

If we apply this scheme to the article concerning the church, we achieve the following:

1) I believe
2) the church
3) which is one, holy, Christian, and apostolic.

The function of the third section in both cases is to set forth in detail what it is the Christian believes about the church and about God, respectively. But in the second example, the lack of the preposition "in" between "believe" and "church" destroys the parallelism and confuses the true point of the confession.

The above argument is not merely a private interpretation. It is based on

he Lutheran conception of the church. We read in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, "Thus also the church is defined by the article in the Creed, which eaches us to believe that there is a 'Holy Catholic Church.' "[1] While the Creed iere mentioned is the Apostles' Creed, the explanation given applies just as nuch to the article concerning the church in the Nicene Creed.

Changing the present text in the Common Service Book to read "And I elieve in one holy Christian and Apostolic Church" would more nearly make he Creed say what it means.

But there is another strong reason for the revision. In the earliest form f the full Nicene Creed[2] the preposition was there exactly as we would expect t to be.[3] Hence we would not be changing the text, but restoring it to its original orm. In fact, the Greek Orthodox Church still has the "in." It was the Western hurch which altered the text for reasons which, as we shall see, are hardly cceptable. According to Harnack,

> The omission of the preposition "in" before "church" is not accidental. In the West it is as old as the attestation of the symbol itself. For it is found in Dionysius Exiguus early in the ixth century, in the Acts of the Synod of Toledo, 589, and in the Mozarabic Liturgy. Not a few of the Latin representations of the symbol have retained the "in," to be sure. However, ome of these are scholarly translations, and in other cases one may recall that according to he usage of the time, "in" could stand merely as a sign of the accusative case. These omissions go back to Augustinian theology, and even further to the Western disinclination o acknowledge anything other than the triune God as object of religious faith in the most exalted sense.[4]

Schaff connects this Latin treatment of the Nicene Creed with the Apostles' Creed. He writes, "The Latin and English versions, in conformity with the Apostles' Creed, mostly omit *in* before *ecclesiam*."[5] Support for this is given in the following explanation of the Apostles' Creed by Rufinus, a contemporary of Augustine:

> It is not said, "*In* the holy church," nor "*In* the forgiveness of sins," nor "*In* the resurrection of the flesh." For if the preposition "in" had been added, it would have had the

1 Apology, IV, 7. On the point that the teaching of Scripture rather than statements of the church are our true source of faith, see R. Prenter, "L'eglise d'apres le temoignage de la Confession d'Augsbourg," in *La Sainte Eglise Universelle* (Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1948), pp. 93-95.

2 The history of what is now generally called the Nicene Creed is complex. However, this does not affect the situation as it concerns us. See Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877), pp. 24 ff.; Harnack, "Konstantinopolitanisches Symbol," in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902), s.v.

3 Schaff, *ibid.*, p. 28; Stewart, *Creeds and Churches* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1916), p. 270.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 14.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 28.

same force as in the preceding articles. But now in those clauses in which the faith concerning the Godhead is declared, we say "*In* God the Father," and "*In* Jesus Christ His Son," and "*In* The Holy Ghost," but in the rest, where we speak not of the Godhead but of creatures and mysteries, the preposition "in" is not added. We do not say "We believe *in* the holy Church," but "We believe the holy Church," not as God, but as the Church gathered to God: and we believe that there is "forgiveness of sins"; we do not say "We believe *in* the forgiveness of sins"; and we believe that there will be a "Resurrection of the flesh"; we do not say "We believe *in* the resurrection of the flesh." By this monosyllabic preposition, therefore, the Creator is distinguished from the creatures, and things divine are separated from things human.[6]

So far as Rufinus' explanation is concerned, it should be remembered that he was commenting on the text of the Apostles' Creed as he found it. His exegesis is of the artificial type so beloved by the Jewish rabbis, and familiar in early Christian theologians. It is not concerned with the historical circumstances behind the writing in question, nor with its most natural meaning. Rather, he hangs his own theological ideas on a mere accident of grammar. There is no evidence that the Apostles' Creed ever included the preposition "in" at the places where Rufinus makes such a point of its omission. Nor would it normally have appeared at those places.

In dropping the preposition from the Nicene Creed, the Western theologians blurred the sense of the Creed. They were attempting to introduce a distinction between the divine and the sub-divine which it is not the intention of the Creed to express. The mechanism, and it is nothing more than that, has less to recommend it than the Jews' pious avoidance of the name "Yahweh" for God, and the substitution of "Lord" or "Heaven" for it.

No one reading the Nicene Creed in English would interpret the lack of "in" before "one holy Christian and Apostolic Church" as the Roman Church does[7] without having first heard the esoteric explanation. For we normally use the phrase "to believe in" with all sorts of objects, sacred and secular, divine and profane. Furthermore, this phrase can connote faith in the existence of the named object, e.g., "I believe in the essential goodness (or depravity) of man."

To continue with our consideration of the historical background of the disappearance of "in" from the Nicene Creed, it is interesting to note that Pope Leo III restored it to the text of the Nicene Creed which he had engraved on a silver tablet in 809.[8] This exception to the prevailing Western reading at so late a date testifies to the survival of the original tradition.

The Reformers had no quarrel with the Nicene Creed as they had received

6 "A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed," 36, in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1892), Vol. III, p. 557.

7 Cf. the Roman Catechism, Part 1, Chap. 10, Question 19.

8 Oehler, *Lehrbuch der Symbolik* (Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1891), p. 61.

t. Hence the original Latin and German of the Book of Concord both lack the preposition "in."

The Anglican church did the same. But whereas the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, as shown above, understood the article on the church rightly, a commentary on the Book of Common Prayer presents this explanation of the article in question: "I believe there is one, and but one, Catholic or Universal Church, which is built upon the foundation of the Apostles, and maintain the Doctrine which they taught."[9]

On the one hand, this agrees with the natural understanding of the article. But, on the other, the reference to maintaining the doctrine seems to be an inference from reading it without the preposition "in." In other words, apparently this is what the Anglican commentator draws from "I believe the church." If the Lutheran Service Book continues to use the present incorrect form of the Creed, it will keep the door open for mistaken explanations of this sort.

George R. Seltzer recently discussed the *Service Book and Hymnal of the Lutheran Church,* soon to be published as a replacement for the present Common Service Book.[10] Concerning the Creeds he wrote:

> Brief changes in the Creeds should be noted. It will be possible, where desired, to say "One holy catholic and apostolic church" or "the holy catholic church" when the Creed is said in worship. It is one of the accidents of language, not of our confession, which gives us "Christian" in the Creeds; and it is most desirable that we conform to the expression that is "original and generally accepted."

If we accept the first criterion proposed, namely originality, we most certainly should restore the preposition "in" to its original position in the Creed.

The second, "generally accepted," is not so easy to apply. One must ask when, where, and why it was accepted. The Eastern church has always accepted "in." The Western church early rejected it. We have seen why. But certainly their reasoning has nothing in common with the Lutheran doctrine of the church. And whereas the Common Service Book has followed the Western usage, the English translators of the Book of Concord did not. Both the Concordia Triglotta of 1921 and the Philadelphia edition of 1911 replaced the "in."

Surely it is just as much "one of the accidents of language" which gives us the Nicene Creed without "in" as it is an accident which gives us "Christian" instead of "Catholic." And from the standpoint of the church of the Reformation, the "accident" which cut out the expressive preposition "in" is more to be deplored than that which substituted "Christian" for "Catholic."

9 Brownell, *The Family Prayer Book, or the Book of Common Prayer, accompanied by a General Commentary* (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1875), p. 100.

10 Seltzer, "The New Liturgy," *The Lutheran Quarterly,* V (1953), p. 10.

Observations on the Church and Segregation

By M. L. Stirewalt, Jr.

THE church has been confronted by problems arising from race relations at various times in her history. The racial problem confronting the church in the South is not new. It has not been sprung unexpectedly upon the church; it is inherited from the past and is composed of a complex set of historical, social, psychological, and moral factors. Under all of these factors composing the problem regarding the church and race relations is basically a neglect of the Scriptures and the resulting weakening of the church's witness before the world. It is the purpose of this paper to record a few observations concerning this situation.

First a few statements to disclose the position of the writer.

The basis for the conduct of the Lutheran Church in the matter of race relations is the same as that by which that church determines a mode of conduct which is in accord with God's will when confronted by any problem concerning the life or practice of the fellowship. Confessing Lutherans search the written word with heart and mind open to the illumination and guidance of the living Word in order to determine the will of God. Thereupon they witness both by lips and by practice to the one who is Lord of all creation. This is the response in love to him who first loved us. This is the confessional basis of Christian conduct and is well stated in the doctrinal basis of the constitutions of Lutheran churches, synods, and congregations: the Scriptures are "the only infallible rule and standard of faith and practice [life]. . . ." The writer takes seriously the words "and practice" in these statements.

The Scriptures clearly teach that "any exclusion of a son of God from the communion of saints, any manifestation or instrument thereof, on such non-ethical grounds as social status, economic resources, or race, is contrary to God's will and revealed love."[1]

Influenced by the complicated motivations of human behavior, men associate with one another and separate from one another. When such practice is the result of the individual's free choice it is not segregation. Segregation is the limitation within a common society of the movements and options of one group of people imposed by another group which claims superiority and which submits to none of these limitations except by free choice. The limitations are imposed by a wide variety of local customs and laws. The claim to superiority may be

1 *Proceedings* of the Convention of the United Evangelical Synod of North Carolina 1954, p. 151.

unconscious and is often denied. The purpose of segregation is to keep the one group economically and socially subservient to the other.

It is our contention that the Scriptures are not being widely studied for the discovery of principles and directives by which to meet the present crisis, and therefore the Church is weakened in her witness to the world. An instructive comparison is found between the approach that was made to the problem of slavery over a century ago and the approach to the present problem.

I

Our ancestors kept slaves. When they were confronted with the moral and religious problem involved, they stoutly defended man's ownership of man by an extensive study of the Bible.[2] The origin of the opposition to slavery must be partially credited to English humanism and partially to the church. It was trumpeted, however, by the church in New England. In the South slavery was defended primarily by an appeal to Scripture. There resulted a debate concerning the interpretation of Scripture the like of which has seldom been heard. This was not an abuse of Scripture by the Southerner. That many read into Scripture what they wanted to find, there can be no doubt. But for the most part it was a sincere and devoted inquiry. Through sermon, tract, book, and lecture, in church, school, and elsewhere the Scriptures were studied and presented. There lies before me a book by William A. Smith, professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy at Randolph-Macon College, *Lectures on the Philosophy and Practice of Slavery* (Nashville, 1865). It is a well-written, clearly presented argument, based largely on the Bible and defending slavery. No one would dare to charge Professor Smith with insincerity. One wonders after reading the book why no one has suggested the re-enslavement of the Negro as a solution to the problem. Of course, the Spirit has led us to understand that the enslavement of human beings is contrary to God's will as it is revealed in his Son. Thus the Scripture as the means of communication of the living Word prevailed. So God always answers and directs when men inquire.

Today the descendents of these same people in the same region are making no similar response when confronted with the moral and religious problem involved in the continued suppression and segregation of the Negro. Again the origin of the opposition to segregation must be credited as much to modern American humanism as to the church, granting ample credit to the National Council, the Society of Friends, and a few bold voices. But at least in North Carolina there is very little evidence of an attempt to defend segregation by a genuine study of the Bible. I have no doubt that anti-integration sermons are

2 See William Sumner Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1935).

being preached in some sections. A few pamphlets are circulated by the sectarians. The attitude is well presented by a statement in an Open Forum letter, "Let's keep Christianity out of the segregation controversy." It is also well attested by the demand of the officials of the University of Mississippi that the speakers for the religious emphasis week avoid any discussion of segregation.

A student poll at Lenoir Rhyne College in the spring of 1954 gave answer that a large majority of the students were unwilling to attend classes with Negroes. I have demanded from hundreds of students that they make their own study if they disagree with my interpretation of the Bible on this subject, especially as it concerns the church and her institutions. I have received one answer. It would be instructive to quote it in full, but respect for the sanctity of the confessional and fear of making myself liable to the charge of inadequate teaching forbid me. The student spent "many days going through the King James Version of the Bible" and could "not find any direct or indirect saying which proves we should or should not have segregation." There followed the inevitable statements of fear of intermarriage and of the Communistic origin of the trend toward integration. No distinction was made between the Christian congregation and the public school.

One cannot document a statement based on an observation that there is no documentation. The following, however, is also pertinent. During the summer of 1955 a group of students made a collection of Open Forum letters addressed to the problem. They read between two and three hundred of these letters for the purpose of analyzing the religious implications. We had hoped to find at least one report to the effect that some congregational auxiliary or Sunday school had conducted a Bible study on the subject. This was not the case. The numerous references to the Bible first attracted our attention to the letters. We knew better than to look for extensive Bible study to be reflected in them. We hoped for something better than we found. I am convinced that the following summary well represents the neglect or the superficial use of the Bible. Occasionally, in letters either pro or con, there is a reference to a biblical passage. More often, especially from the opposition, are indefinite references to "Moses," "the immutable laws of God," "the confusion of tongues." The majority are only emotional outbursts garbed as righteous indignation by such phrases as "this ungodly thing," "the work of the Devil," "God separated the races and intends to keep them that way," "my Bible tells me to keep segregated." There are also oracles who would tell us, "If God had intended thus-and-so, he would have acted in such-and-such a way."

There is not much evidence that those who oppose the continued practice of segregation by the congregation are basing their position on Bible study. The same group of students also made a collection of the official pronouncements of the denominations. Anti-segregation statements come from organizational levels above the local congregation and from all the denominations with major representation in North Carolina. The pronouncements from Lutheran bodies are based on Scripture

and speak to the church. In the case of the others, the scriptural basis is not always clearly presented nor the distinction between church and secular communities clearly drawn. However, as Dr. Frank Loescher would remind us, these pronouncements are prepared and adopted by a comparatively small group and are neither representative nor very effective.[3] So it has been in the Synod of North Carolina (ULCA), which adopted a resolution in 1954 calling for a program of Christian education in race relations in all its congregations.

The most hopeful field for effective Bible study on this subject would of course be at the congregational level in Sunday schools and auxiliaries. It would be a large undertaking to make an accurate survey. There are signs that a sincere study of the Bible is under way. Women's groups of the large denominations are facing the problem. Sunday school literature is beginning to offer well prepared lessons. The pastors of the Southern Conference of the North Carolina Synod and the Lutheran Students' Association of the Southeastern Region have requested and received the writer's Bible study on "The Church and Segregation."

We are from many sides accused of biblical illiteracy. This illiteracy is an ignorance both of the content of the Bible and of its correct use. Furthermore, the accusation implies a lack of belief in the authority of the Bible and its relevance to our world. We have done nothing more in the above than to illustrate the serious consequences of this situation in one phase of the present day.

II

The second observation is that the church in the conduct of her life, the pattern of her society, has adopted the pattern of the secular community in the matter of race relations.

There is a general, unquestioned assumption that the practice of the church need not differ from that which is acceptable in the secular community. Or to express the same thing more accurately in the affirmative: the practice of the church must conform to the community mores. Here is the final measure of the breach between confession and practice, faith and life.

There is nothing new in the temptation constantly harassing the Christian and the fellowship to conform to the world. St. Paul insisted that the conduct of Christians individually and as the fellowship must demonstrate to the world the fact of oneness with the living and abiding Saviour. The Reformation reaffirmed the confessional basis of Christian conduct. In the matter of segregation the church has conformed to the pattern set by the world. This pattern is generally accepted without any noticeable modification or divergence within the various communions.

The general attitude at the congregational level is "wait-and-see." That is, the action of the congregation should await any modification of the current practice in

3 Frank S. Loescher, *The Protestant Church and the Negro* (Association Press, 1948), pp. 48-49.

the community. In addition, some pastors and congregations openly support segregation in the church. I am told that some congregations retain "white clauses" in their constitutions. On the other hand, some pastors and congregations take a bold stand. The press has adequately reported these ventures. What has happened to the Roman Catholic experiment in North Carolina, I do not know. It appears that the center of experimentation has shifted to New Orleans. The Unitarian congregation in Charlotte has recently adopted a pro-integration statement. A Baptist congregation near Hickory has practiced integration for many years.

The United Lutheran Church in North Carolina holds an interesting position. Not many of the German Lutheran settlers in this state owned slaves, but both of the synods occupying North Carolina were concerned about the spiritual welfare of the Negro after emancipation. There were four Negro pastors in the North Carolina Synod in 1889. This was a most difficult period, and separatism was in vogue. The Negro pastors requested permission to form their own synod. The permission was granted. The Alpha Synod, as it was called, subsequently applied for affiliation with the Missouri Synod. Since that time the United Lutheran Church has conducted no ministry to the Negro in North Carolina. There is no Negro congregation of the U.L.C. in the state. One survey was made in a promising Negro community, and opportunities appear in several other places, but so far it has been impossible to secure one Negro Lutheran pastor. There are no indigenous Negro Lutheran students and therefore no pastors. Several white pastors have offered to serve these people. Perhaps this is the only tentative solution.

We must sympathize with the parish pastor who is deeply concerned by the accepted practice of the church. If he speaks and acts too positively and is not immediately removed from effectve service, his ministry to the congregation which has called him is greatly curtailed. One pastor put it squarely up to his council when he was approached by a Negro Lutheran widow living in a house adjoining the church property. She asked only for some devotional material since there was no Negro Lutheran church of any synod in the community. He pressed the matter further and took it to the council. The council refused to permit her to worship with the congregation. The pastor charged the council with the responsibility. Another pastor visits several Lutheran teachers in his community and administers private Communion to them in the church. Still another is gravely troubled as he drives each Sunday from one church in his parish to the other and passes through a Negro community which has no Christian ministry.

This short survey is sufficient to illustrate our theme, that the church at the level of the congregation is reflecting society rather than infecting society. That we should expect no more from the congregation than from a well reputed civic club is also demonstrated in the manner in which the arguments for segregation are carried from the world into the church. We might illustrate by several of them, but one will be sufficient. We shall not avoid the fundamental one, the one most distasteful of all, the fear of miscegenation.

The fear of "mixed marriages" is inevitably raised regardless of where, with whom, or from what approach the matter of race relations is discussed. It is the final word which decisively and automatically counteracts argument or pleading for any step toward integration. It is as readily and as widely used in reference to the church as it is used in reference to other institutions and social contacts. It is useless to point out that it is often used as a front to support segregation for other social and economic reasons.

The negative attitude is reached from two different points of view. To one group it is impossible to imagine that the church could give her blessing to a marriage between a Negro and a white. The inference is therefore that all such unions would be immoral. And so the church must forbid membership in the congregation to certain confessing Christians on the ground that fellowship with them might result in sin. This is not the church, and every Christian must reject the implications of this position when he realizes its full significance.

The second point of view is held by those who sincerely believe that united fellowship within the congregation would ultimately lead to true marriage between members of the two races. This is the point which is too difficult to meet with sanity and spiritual enlightenment because men's reactions are so surcharged with emotion. Even the Roman Church, with its strong control of marriages, is having difficulty with this emotionalism. Perhaps it will take the application of civil law in various areas of the world to demonstrate even to Christians that integration does not mean the collapse of man's natural gregariousness; that the Negro will no more flock to the open church than he will to the school once reserved for whites;[4] that integration is only the lifting of the suppression of segregation, a recognition of equality which once was thought to rest ultimately on man's equality before God.

This, of course, involves us in a profound sociological study. Our only purpose here is to observe that the church has assumed only the negative attitude of the world and in this matter is living under the dispensation of the Old Covenant. This is not the church. To limit the proclamation of the Gospel by hedging it with exclusive interpretations in order to defend an exclusive fellowship, and at the same time to neglect the proclamation of the Gospel to one quarter of the population of a state, is to do legalistic violence to the Gospel. The affirmative proclaiming of the universal Gospel fearlessly and boldly is the only solution.

The relation between the neglect of the Word of God and the church's witness should be clear to a Lutheran. The time for soul-searching and decision is at hand. The problem of interracial fellowship in Christ has been met before. The Lord of the church will direct it again to the solution even if it necessitates cross-bearing on the part of his people.

4 See Cabell Phillips, "Another Trial of Integration," in *The New York Times Magazine*, March 4, 1956, pp. 14 ff.

Christianity and Culture

By Walter Buschmann

GORDON ALLPORT in his psychological interpretation, *The Individual and his Religion*, states that "the supplanting of one religion by another is not possible unless the culture itself is basically altered. The threads of religion are lock-stitched into the social and economic fabric."[1] He finds support for this view in two factors: the findings of cultural anthropology, which assert that an important source of the religious feeling is in conformity to culture, particularly as this conformity is impressed on the pre-adolescent child; and evidence from history, which adds two points: that all religions have developed organizations because of the myth and ritual which are prominent in the culture in which the religion finds itself, and that the disruption of a religious belief and organization leads to a disruption of culture because religious "systems" are inextricably bound to culture. At the same time, however, Allport refuses to attribute religion to culture or to define religion as a mere design for living in a specific culture, for he sees quite correctly the essentially individual, personal basis of the religious sentiment. Yet, he feels bound to regard a religious "system" as so connected with the culture as to be unalterable prior to a change in culture.

Unfortunately, Allport seems to base his idea of religious "systems" upon the myth and ritual which are connected with any certain religion but which—quite definitely in Christianity, though to a lesser degree in other religions—are not integral but which should be regarded as peripheral.[2] That even Christianity has failed in the past so to consider its mythical and ritualistic elements should not obscure the fact of their irrelevant nature. Further, that Allport should include Christianity with other religions in grouping them as inseparable from culture, though again partially the fault of the Christian religion itself, is a basic error which Kraemer in his book, *Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*, attempts to refute.

In his discussion of the primitive naturalistic religions, Kraemer points out that each of them is not only a religion but also a "culture and civilization at the same time."[3] In fact, the purpose of such religions is to justify the cultural

1 Gordon W. Allport, *The Individual and his Religion* (New York, 1954), p. 24.

2 Very few would deny that there are such elements in Christianity, though what specifically is myth or ritual would be strongly debated. It is not the purpose here to attempt such definition.

3 H. Kraemer, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1938), p. 147.

status quo and to attempt to preserve without change the civilization. They are even the regulative force in many societies, especially in Africa.[4] The Chinese and Japanese religious systems are equated with primitive religions by Kraemer, for their basis is a naturalistic monism and they, too, are bound to the specific culture and civilization.

The other great religious systems of the world (excluding Christianity) also have been bound with culture, civilization, or race. Thus Hinduism and Buddhism, as Kraemer points out, are essentially naturalist-monistic in nature and therefore bound to a closely-knit social organization. The caste system in Hinduism is found to be an integral part of the theology as one of the two real criteria which the religion admits.[5] Radhakrishnan, however, is willing to reject the caste system as Hindu mythology,[6] but to do this is actually to reject Hinduism, for the whole anthropological doctrine is based upon *dharma*, which is "indissolubly connected" with the caste system,[7] and the whole theology relies upon the concept of *karma* which determines caste.[8] Buddhism has been able to rid itself of the caste system by also denying the Hindu concept of *dharma* and thus practically to free itself from culture; but it is still basically naturalist-monistic and it carries this to the extreme of "absolute relativism."[9] Islam, on the other hand, in its emphasis on the "Moslem community as an 'umma ruled by the Law of God and his Apostle . . . is a theocracy, a community that is (by the very nature of its foundation) a religious, political, and social unit."[10] Judaism, of course, has been limited by its racial character throughout all of history.

Thus Allport's first comment that a source of religious feeling is the cultural conformity of the "in-group" is a sweeping generalization which cannot stand if a religion is such that it can be freed from the myth and ritual in which it has been formulated at a particular time of history and in a particular culture. In regard to naturalistic religions, Allport is correct, although even they, in such advanced forms as Hinduism (as represented by modern theologians like Radhakrishnan) and Buddhism, can conceivably free themselves from their cultural heritage. Christianity has just recently recovered the insight that its basis, not being a naturalistic one, nor a philosophical approach which must of necessity be bound to a specific culture, but rather the historical revelation of God in

4 Edwin W. Smith, *Knowing the African* (London, 1946), p. 69.

5 Kraemer, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

6 Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, *Recovery of Faith* (New York, 1955).

7 Kraemer, p. 164, and Edmund Davison Soper, *The Philosophy of the Christian World Mission* (New York, 1943), p. 167.

8 Thus in a country such as British Guiana, where there are no caste lines, Hinduism has been dying a slow death.

9 Kraemer, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

10 Kraemer, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

Christ, is not bound to culture or to cultural patterns. That this was not always the case can be easily shown. Even such a pioneer as Father Heyer seemed unable to cut away from Western culture; for instance, at baptism natives were given "Christian" names which were, of course, Western names, and there was an attempt to mechanize the weavers in the name of the Christian mission.[11] Alexander Duff was another pioneer who could not separate the Western culture in which he had been educated from Christianity.[12] Or, in the case of Africa, the same tendency is seen in the wholesale stripping of initiatory rites from the life of the native[13] and the demand to outlaw polygamy before the basic problem of the status of women is solved.[14] The most vivid illustration of the refusal of Christianity to disentangle itself from culture is perhaps in the field of the arts, for the architecture of the Christian churches in Africa and the Orient is invariably that of Europe or America with no relation to the rich heritage of the native climate.

But that this has happened in the past is no reason to affirm that Christianity cannot separate itself from culture. In fact, the prophetic task of Christianity is not only to free itself from cultural conformity as it spreads outside of the Western world but also to free itself from that same conformity in its native areas.[15] Athough the argument of the cultural anthropologists to whom Allport refers is an empirical one, it can also be refuted on the same grounds. Christianity has penetrated new cultures and varying civilizations throughout its history.[16] In Africa today Christianity has been taken to the tribal village as well as to the industrialized, Westernized cities.[17] Indonesia has witnessed a striking change in its religious scene as Christianity has entered and made wide inroads on the "primitive" religion of the people while the culture has not changed sufficiently to call it "Western." The same is true of the history of Christianity in India, where cultural changes have largely grown out of the impact of Christianity and not vice versa. In fact, it is the influence of the Christian religion throughout the world which has to a large degree revitalized the native religions and has led to social revolutions and cultural changes without at the same time introducing Western culture.[18] The changes have taken place upon the background of the native culture; it is all the more impressive to consider this fact against the back-

11 E. Theodore Bachmann, *They Called Him Father* (Philadelphia, 1942), pp. 182, 192.

12 William Paton, *Alexander Duff* (London, 1923), p. 210.

13 Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

14 Smith, pp. 90-97, and Godfrey E. Phillips, *The Old Testament in the World Church* (London, 1942), p. 125.

15 See the discussion of the nominal Christian by J. B. Phillips, *The Church Under the Cross* (New York, 1956).

16 See Soper, p. 262, on the early church.

17 Soper, p. 262; see also Smith.

18 Kraemer, p. 46.

ground of the effort of Christian missionary work consciously to carry Western standards into these areas.

The evidence which Allport deduces from history is subject to the same cross-examination which is applied to the arguments from cultural anthropology. Certainly, as regards Christianity, the argument that a religion is tied to its mythical and ritualistic elements loses its ground, for these elements stand under the judgment of the cross of Christ just as do the same elements in other religions. If Christianity demands that its myth and ritual be accepted, as it has so often done in the past, then Allport is correct. But that this is not the essential framework of the Christian message is fortunately being realized in today's theology.[19] It seems that here is the great function of apologetic theology in the mission task; in agreement with Luther and with Barth it must be stated that apologetic theology must never be an attempt to harmonize or to mesh Christianity with another religion, nor to defend it against attack, for the Gospel is its own defense. But, conversely, the task of this type of theology is to place the emphasis exactly where it is in the New Testament—upon Jesus Christ and him crucified. It is on this event, stripped of the mythology and the symbolism and the ritual of the period in which it was born, that the emphasis must be placed, and it is this message which must be carried to the mission frontiers. Thus it might be said that the task of apologetic theology is to remove the false intellectual stumbling-block of the Christian faith (that is, the mythology and ritual) and present the basic message, the real stumbling-block, the folly of Christianity (the cross of Christ and the divine forgiveness which it proclaims; the incarnate Son of God who must become a servant among men because man has so rebelled against God that he cannot find him unless he come as a servant; and the resurrection of the crucified Christ for the justification of mankind). It is this message which must be stripped of non-essentials and presented anew to the younger churches in a "variety of expression and approach,"[20] just as this was done in the New Testament itself.

But Allport also states that the intimate connection between culture and religion is shown by the fact that the culture is disrupted whenever the religious organization is drastically altered or destroyed. This is an obvious consequence when religion is tied to the cultural climate in which it is located, as in the case of the naturalist primitive and Oriental religions or even in the case of the Christian religion when it, too, becomes inextricably bound to cultural surroundings. This certainly provides a real problem for the Christian mission because the introduction of Christianity, whereas it may not change the culture, will of necessity lead to a disruption of old religious beliefs and organization. This, how-

19 Kraemer, p. 420, and Soper, p. 102.
20 Kraemer, p. 85.

ever, is a procedure which follows the introduction of the new religion and not one which precedes any change in religion. Particularly the social aspect of the life of those who have been living under naturalistic religions is altered quite visibly and forcibly simply because these religions are so closely tied to cultural life. But, as in the early church, the social aspect of Christianity, which is of the essence of the religion, must be adaptable to the society into which the Christian message is taken. The mission must be able to replace the old cultural patterns which have been disrupted with new and more suitable social expressions; the tragedy that has occurred when this task has been overlooked or thwarted by governmental interference is all too evident.[21] But this new social life must be built on the old heritage, the old foundation, the inherent culture. This is admirably summarized by Kraemer when he states: "The Christian approach should combine . . . the great self-denying effort to recognize the relativity of our own accustomed religious, cultural, and ecclesiastical apprehensions and patterns, and, on account of that, their frequent inapplicability to the peoples with whom we have to deal . . . [and] the obligatory attempt to employ in a creative and imaginative way the mental and social means of indigenous expression. . . ."[22]

Thus the objection which Allport makes to the extension of a religion without a cultural change preceding it can hardly be supported on the basis of historical evidence, nor is it compatible with Christianity itself. But his objection might be based on one further factor, which is the essence of his entire book—that the religious sentiment, because it is the supreme unifying and integrating force in the human personality, cannot be altered without preparation; therefore, the culture must be changed in order to lay the groundwork for the alteration in the religious beliefs of an individual whose life is directed by these beliefs. It is here that the whole subject of the point of contact betwen non-Christian and Christian is brought into the foreground.

It would appear that on a psychological basis the point of contact would be the religious sentiment, the need to believe. The almost universal belief in a higher power, whether that be personal or impersonal, immanent or transcendent, is one of the factors of outstanding importance to the missionary. It is here that a point of contact is already established between religions. Again, Radhakrishnan notes that one common element in all religions is the mystical element, and this would seem to be only an intensified form of man's striving for God, the belief of man in a higher power. That this search for God is in itself sinful in so far as it places man above God is not debatable from the Christian standpoint. Yet the point of contact cannot be denied. What is the essential message, stripped

21 Soper, p. 263, and Smith, p. 97. Perhaps the point is best demonstrated in Alan Paton's great novel, *Cry, the Beloved Country.*

22 Kraemer, pp. 343 f.

of its mythology and ritual as it must be? What is the *kerygma?* It is this: Only through the revelation in Christ, through the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection, can God be truly known. It is only in this historical revelation that the true nature of God is seen, and it is only through Christian witness that this true nature can be communicated. This is what Kraemer states when he points out that the only true point of contact is the missionary himself.[23] The witness of the missionary is the only manner in which the true nature of God as revealed in Christ is to be made known to the world.[24] Nor is this limited to the missionary, for it is only in this witness by the Christian to the risen Lord that Christianity can ever be communicated in whatever culture at whatever time. So, again, the whole task of the Christian missionary movement, in the light of the apologetic theology that stands behind the witness of the missionary on the field, is to remove the cultural and intellectual stumbling-blocks which have surrounded the Christian witness and to proclaim again that revelation with which St. Paul was content, "For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified." This is the message that transcends all cultures.

23 Kraemer, p. 140.

24 Thus Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York, 1954), Vol. I, pp. 288-292, points out that God's grace and agape as conceived in the New Testament are always action, deed, witness, not verbalizing or rationalizing.

Life and Thought in World Lutheranism

Bishops and Church Administration in Denmark

The basic assignment, given to those of us who report on the churches of various countries, is that we tell about events and developments which have basic and far-reaching significance and that we avoid a mere chronicling of events which can be found in daily newspapers or weekly church papers. This is an important assignment, and it can have value in contributing to an understanding and evaluation of church life in predominantly Lutheran lands, but it is an assignment which is quite difficult for the one who is to report about church life in Denmark. The general picture of church life in that country is rather diffuse, and it is almost impossible to draw a simplified and easily comprehensible picture which is true to what is actually happening. But perhaps a few peeks into routine situations or relatively minor matters under discussion may be revealing to American readers.

In a general way the main items of discussion during the last year or so have been administrative matters, but this is probably in itself a revealing thing. Behind the discussion of these lie varying points of view, but it is rather indicative that the points of view are reflected primarily in matters of administration.

Two new bishops have been elected. They have also been appointed and consecrated, but the news story lies in their election rather than in the subsequent events or in the positions and personalities of the men involved. For the creation of a new bishop is a political event and not necessarily the emergence to a position of spiritual significance of a man who has shown great leadership and who can be expected to give leadership. The bishop is primarily an administrative officer, and his election is involved in ecclesiastical politics. This does not exclude the possibility that the men recently elected may be excellent churchmen and that they deserve high honors. They may incidentally show great leadership in the days to come, and such potentialities have undoubtedly influenced the electors, but the story still lies in the practical—or political—aspects of their election.

The bishop of Haderslev retired from office, and the bishop of Ribe died. To elect their successors a democratic machinery was set in motion under the direction of the state's ministry of ecclesiastical affairs. Qualified electors, lay and clerical, representing a minimum number of the total electors, met for the purpose of nomination. Spontaneously meetings were held in various places, and after a period of negotiation two candidates were placed on the ballot for official election to each office. In both instances the candidates represented the two major traditional groupings within the church, Inner Mission and Grundtvigian. The fact that these two groups were exclusively repre-

sented does not mean that there are no other groups. On the contrary, there are many groupings, at least among the clergy. Speaking in terms that are familiar from other areas, we could mention Barthians, Bultmannites, the liturgically minded, the socially minded the ecumenically minded, and perhaps other groups. The nominations merely reflect the fact that no groups other than the two older ones could hope to elect a candidate. The others therefore join forces with the two major groups in varying alliances, and nominees are chosen who, it is hoped, will gain the support of as many electors as possible. In a sense this is strange, for the task of the bishop is mainly administrative, and a primary concern should really be whether he can administer fairly and efficiently.

The election proper follows the ancient formula of "the clergy and the people" (*clerus et populus*) of the diocese. The people vote through representatives, namely, the elected members of the parish councils. These council members have previously been elected in a democratic local election by the qualified voters of the parish. A qualified voter is anyone who has paid his church tax and who has not by a definite and voluntary act excluded himself from the church. For the parish elections the councilors are nominated by any group which so desires, and such groups may vary, but the three major groups which usually nominate are the Grundtvigians, the Inner Mission people, and the Social Democrats. With the clergy these regularly elected councilors then vote in the episcopal contest. After the votes have been counted the state's ministry of ecclesiastical affairs nominates one of the candidates to the king, who makes the appointment. The ministry is not obligated to nominate the man who has the most votes, but it always does, and the appointment by the king is a rubber stamp.

Of the 1956 elections the one in Haderslev came first. Here the candidate of the Inner Mission, Frode Beyer, was elected. The losing candidate was promptly nominated for the diocese at Ribe when it became vacant a few months later, and here H. Dons Christensen won by a narrow margin over his Inner Mission opponent.

The fact that the bishop's task is mainly administrative does not exclude decisions that may involve theological issues and personal convictions. Such an issue came up recently when the parish council at Skive decided to call a woman as assistant pastor. This was legal, for parliament had passed a law some years before permitting the calling and ordination of women as pastors. At that time three women were ordained, so the church and the public had become adjusted to female ecclesiastics. In order to maintain the freedom of the bishop, however, the law had also made it legal for a bishop to refuse to ordain and supervise a woman pastor. In case of such refusal (and this had happened when one of the three was ordained) another bishop could take over the episcopal functions.

The controversy thus seemed to have been settled, if not to the satisfaction of all church people, at least in such a manner that public polemics had died down. The appointment at Skive stirred

it up again, however, for the quirks of ecclesiastical law required action of the bishop in the appointment of assistant pastors, and this had not been covered by the new law. The bishop of the diocese refused such participation in this case, claiming that for theological and conscientious reasons he could not be a party to the act. A great deal of fuss and fury was consequently engendered, and the whole debate about women pastors blossomed out again. This time it was more subdued, however, and opponents to women ministers felt frustrated, for it was known by all that the bishop, although he had an opportunity for public testimony and made good use of it, could not prevent the inevitable. Another law was passed, plugging the loophole. A neighboring bishop promptly ordained the lady and the reverberations died down. But the character of the church as a relatively neutral administrative operation on the part of the people had again been demonstrated. Freedom prevailed, both for the congregation which desired a woman pastor and for the bishop who could not conscientiously ordain her, but not for those who claimed biblical ground for silencing women in the congregation.

The rights and freedoms of parishes to choose their ministers has for some time been safeguarded by law, but this freedom sometimes works contrary to the best interest of the ministers. Certain pastors have had difficulty in moving to another church, and pastors who have served abroad as missionaries, seamen's pastors, or in Danish churches in foreign lands have found parishes at home reluctant to call them. To remedy this situation efforts have been made to revise the laws governing the call. The state's administrative head of the church, Mrs. Bodil Koch, has introduced a bill in parliament which would make it obligatory for a parish, every fifth time an appointment is made through the ministry of ecclesiastical affairs, to select a pastor from one of the following categories: (1) ministers over fifty years of age, (2) ministers who have served fifteen years in a parish, (3) ministers who have served a church in Greenland, the Faroe Islands, or in foreign lands for at least seven years, (4) ministers who have served in other capacities than the parish ministry for nine years. The proposal shows how strong the rights of the parishes have become in a country where for centuries ministers were appointed by the crown.

Mrs. Bodil Koch, the minister of ecclesiastical affairs in the Social Democratic government, is more than a capable administrator. She is a graduate in theology from Copenhagen University (incidentally she is the wife of Professor Hal Koch) and is a competent theologian. In the running discussion, which has been going on for some time, concerning the nature of the Church of Denmark, she has taken a stand which demonstrates her ability as an independent thinker. Currently the argument about the church has been joined by Professors Lindhardt and Prenter, colleagues at Aarhus. Professor Lindhardt calls the Danish Church an institution promoting religion, limited to the Christian religion but open to all sorts of interpretation and with judgment of the true faith left to the individual. In response, Professor Prenter grants the freedom and

atitude of the church, but he maintains hat the church nevertheless is con-essional in character. Mrs. Koch, while differing somewhat from both men, is more on the Prenter side of the argument. "The folk church," she says, "is civil arrangement with a departmental apparatus, with laws and regulations, but it is more than this. It is also the church of Christ which lives by the confession and proclamation of the Word and by this alone. . . . The church does not represent any and all ideas. It builds on a Lutheran understanding of man and of Christianity."

J. KNUDSEN

Correspondence and Comment

Heresy and Christianity: A Reply to Professor Roth

The words which follow have been written with great hesitation. In the first place, I am one who is "without authority" in a very specific sense. In the second place, the very nature of the situation with which this article is concerned cries out that someone else should be its author. In the third place, the motives I have for writing at all can be very easily misunderstood by those not directly in touch with the situation. Nevertheless, the interest of truth—truth that is unseparated from Christ—calls for words somewhat similar to those which follow, and it is in this interest that I write. What follows is my reply to the article "Heresy and the Lutheran Church" in the August, 1956, number of The Lutheran Quarterly. That article purports to deal with heresy in general, with the rôle of the United Lutheran Church's Northwest Synod in its action against George P. Crist, and (by implication) with the alleged rectitude of the latter action. (At this point the reader should know that I am a close friend of George Crist; that I have been tarred with at least half of the same stick as he; and that I have been personally acquainted with Professor Robert Paul Roth, author of the article in question, for the last several years in what I have always understood to be a friendly way.)

The over-all effect of Professor Roth's article is very distressing to me. It is distressing to find such summary dismissal by him of Greek Gnosticism and "modern existentialism." His article implies that both of these are to be categorically rejected by any Christian. But one cannot dismiss such things by bald assertions. Professor Heinecken's article in the same number of the Quarterly is at least a preliminary answer to the unfounded charges against "existentialism." To throw out existentialism categorically would mean to throw out Luther and Kierkegaard and, I suspect, Jesus Christ. And surely enough has been written by those more competent to establish that Christianity is indebted to Gnosticism at least for much of its terminology. The Pauline and Johannine writings combat the fallacies in Hellenistic Gnosticism the most effectively of all the New Testament literature; and these same writings are the most frequent of all in their use of Gnostic vocabulary and thought structure. It would seem to me that the interest of truth would have been better served had Professor Roth made a comparison between what was indeed a fallacious element in Gnosticism (i.e., the idea of "salvation by knowledge") and the similarly and equally fallacious attitude of so much contemporary "orthodoxy" (i.e., salvation by assent to the "pure teaching"). A good case in opposition to the article in question could be made on this ground alone. But I do not think it to be the most crucial matter.

It is also distressing (almost to the point of frustration) to find in the article one bald assertion after another without offering evidence either from Scripture, or from classical Christianity, or from the Confessions. Read some of these assertions again: ". . . *Because* he is Messiah he was in fact born of a virgin" (p. 247). ". . . If they [the virgin birth, the *physical* resurrection, the ascension] are taken away, the incarnation itself is taken away" (p. 249). "Mark, John, and Paul presuppose it [the virgin birth]" (p. 251). "Jesus is not proclaimed as Messiah because he was obedient to the Spirit of God, but rather because he was the Son of God he is found to be obedient" (p. 250). From whence come such baldly asserted causal relations? Not from Scripture, nor from classical Christianity, nor from the Confessions. Professor Roth is, of course, free to hold these opinions himself; but when nonconformity with them is declared just reason for reading a man out of the church, truth is not being served. He might do well to read what Gustav Aulen has to say about several of these matters in *The Faith of the Christian Church,* and along with it the comments of Professor Sittler in "A Christology of Function," in the QUARTERLY for May, 1954. I think Professor Roth's article can well be called in question solely on the basis of his many ungrounded assertions. But this, for me, is still not the crucial question.

It is also distressing to find such quick repudiation of one of the stature of Reinhold Niebuhr. Anyone, of course, is free to disagree with anyone else. But disagreement by Christians needs to take a more honest form than that which is before us. How does one find in Professor Niebuhr's brief article in *The Lutheran* of Dec. 21, 1955, the ground for the remarkable charges made against him on pp. 249 and 250 of Professor Roth's article? An earnest reader would certainly want to hear Niebuhr's own explanation of his use of the words "spiritual," "incarnation," etc. And an earnest reader might also want to ask Professor Roth just what it means to take *literally* the Johannine phrase "the Word became flesh." It seems to this reader, at any rate, that every word in that short phrase needs careful interpretation. The unwarranted attack upon a particular individual seems to me to call in question the validity of the entire article; and this comes somewhat closer to that which is for me the crucial question.

Deeply disturbing to me, and also very revealing, is the attempt to fasten *new* charges on George Crist. (An underlying stratum of acute embarrassment over the whole affair is revealed here. A hue and cry has been raised in several circles about the nature of the "charges" around which the "heresy" trials centered. Professor Roth has made what I think to be a totally mistaken effort to make more fundamental facets of Christianity depend *causally* upon the "peripheral" matters which did constitute the charges. But he has also made new charges. Personal conversations with Professor Roth this past summer lead me to the conviction that this attempt grows out of nothing else than a real embarrassment over the original charges, coupled with a desire nevertheless to justify the synod's action.)

The foregoing parenthesis is, of course, my own opinion. It is nevertheless true that specifically new charges appear in the article: George Crist is "a modern gnostic of the adoptionist variety" (p. 246); it is implied that he (Crist) claimed that "facts or reports of facts are inconceivable" in a "purely subjective way" (p. 247); throughout the article he is accused of denying any validity to the incarnation or the resurrection (whereas the actual charges were concerned with the virgin birth and the *physical* resurrection); he is charged with "adoptionism" again on p. 250; and on the same page he is alleged to hold incorrect opinions about the Holy Spirit and the atonement. If the purpose of Professor Roth's article is to encourage further antipathy toward George Crist, and if such a purpose is ever Christianly justifiable, then the introduction of additional charges under conditions which preclude suitable reply from the accused might be proper. But if the purpose of the article is truth, then such tactics must be rejected. And now we are very close to that which seems to me to be the most crucial matter.

What distresses me most of all about the article is the fact that Professor Roth is writing about someone who is a complete stranger to me. While the article is to a great degree intended to be impersonal, it must never be forgotten that a specific person was charged with the alleged deviations (old and new). Such glimpses of a person as manage to break through the article here and there are not glimpses of George P. Crist at all! Professor Roth paused for a moment beside the clear pure pool of truth when he wrote (p. 248), "By what a man says *and does* he communicates his spirit to others, and in this way alone is it possible to determine whether he has the same Holy Spirit in common with other members of the body of Christ." (It is my opinion that he turned his back upon the truth with the very next sentence, and continued away from it thereafter; but this sentence, at least, speaks to the truth.) Herein is the irony and the tragedy and the demonic element in the entire affair. At no point in the whole sorry "heresy" proceedings in the Synod of the Northwest was any honest effort made to learn George Crist's spirit, nor to give him open opportunity to "communicate his spirit." Another (and equally Christian) way of saying the same thing is to say that no effort was made to know George Crist as a person—and when any words he may have spoken or written are divorced from his person and spirit, the interest of truth has been disavowed.[1] Not only does Professor Roth's article fail utterly to present George Crist fairly; the whole affair failed in this respect precisely because no attempt was made to succeed. I shall try to substantiate this claim in the paragraph which follows; but a word from George Crist himself is apropos here. When I first read Professor Roth's article I immediately wrote George Crist about it. Just one sentence from a letter he sent me after reading the article will

1 Would any of us, for example, want to introduce Luther to somebody who knew nothing of him by asking that person to read only those writings of Luther which came from the most polemically charged periods of his life?

e a sufficient quotation: "He [Professor Roth] knows *nothing* about ne."

This, I maintain, epitomizes the ronic, tragic, demonic element in the ntire affair. Here are some of the lain facts in the matter: (1) One pasor of the synod told me nearly eighteen nonths before things finally came to head that he was "out to get George Crist if it was the last thing" he ever lid. He made the same declaration to thers during the time preceding offiial action. After Crist's trial was ver, he made a quite open announcement that he had set out to bring this bout and had accomplished it. On a ood many occasions preceding the rial I personally pleaded with this nan that he seek to know George Crist etter before jumping to unwarranted onclusions. He, however, persistently efused to have anything to do with George Crist, and made it quite clear hat his refusal was deliberate. (2) The first open indication that something was afoot was a terse official communication (received on the same lay by the three "principals") directng us to appear for official questioning y two officers of the synod, said offiers having been alerted by "persistent umors." This meeting was an interrogation, not a counseling session. Not nce, either then or since, were we given the names of the one or ones who initiated the rumors. In the case with which I am most familiar (my own) not one solitary point contained in any of the "rumors" ever appeared (even in modified form) as a "charge" upon which I was ultimately tried! More is revealed here than just a lack of effort to know the accused in truth, but at least that is revealed. (3) Subsequently another interrogation was held, before a group which included the synod's examining committee. Some charges were formulated as a result of this interrogation. One month after that second interrogation an officer of the synod visited all three of us privately (the only individual and private meeting in the entire proceeding). This officer stated emphatically both to John Gerberding and to me, "We want to save you for the church, but George Crist has to go!" (4) Of more than 150 ministers in the synod available for such assignment, the five-man investigating committee (corresponding to a grand jury in civil affairs) had assigned to it two ministers who are known throughout the synod for their ultra-conservatism (both come from Missouri Synod backgrounds). (5) The executive committee of synod followed most eagerly the recommendation of the Crist trial committee that he be suspended from the ministry until synod as a whole could act on his case; Crist was suspended immediately. They signally failed to follow the co-linear recommendation of the trial committee that he be paid a living salary until synod could convene (George Crist is married and has three small children). When finally a grant of $500 was given him, more than three months after his suspension, the action was publicly announced as a "charitable act" by the synod. (6) Professor Roth, in gathering material for his article, apparently had open access to the official transcript of the Crist trial without cost to himself. The other two of us who were tried by synod received copies of the transcripts of our respec-

tive trials without cost. George Crist was refused such a free copy and had to purchase one "out of pocket" (349 pages of typescript at 40c per page!) simply in order to have one available to himself. (7) A special convention of synod was called in January, 1956, to act on the three cases. The president of synod had previously given written assurance that all matters pertaining to the conduct of the investigation and trials would be subject to review at this convention. However, at the convention itself, he made an opening declaration that "theological debate" would not be permitted. When, then, Professor George W. Forell sought to take issue with the procedures that were followed, he was successively shouted down by the delegates, gaveled down by the president, and declared "out of order" for the bulk of his protest.

These are not pleasant things to be writing, and they stir up many unhappy memories. But the interest of truth requires that, if *any* of the story is to be aired, the *whole* story should be told. This has not been the whole of it by any means, but it is something of what it looks like from this side of the story. I repeat my contention that no serious, honest effort was ever made to know George Crist. And if some will then say (as a few have already said to me), "This is not a question of theology, but is rather a question of the handling of people," then I am constrained to reply that the theology of the New Testament (as well as the prophetic theology of the Old Testament) is fundamentally a theology of the handling of people. In classical terminology we would say that truly Christian theology is remarkably anthropocentric. This is not at all to claim that "man is the measure of things" in a Swinburnian sense; it is to say that, Christianly speaking, God is revealed not in his "naked essence" but in the midst of human affairs. This is implicit in the doctrine of the incarnation, and it is magnificently explicit in the life of the Incarnate One. The "fruit of the Spirit" is not "pure teaching," but rather it is "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control"—and these are all matters which have to do with life in community, with the "handling of people." Christianly this is true at every level of existence: When we pray we say, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us." Ethics, incarnation, and atonement are inextricably intertwined: "Let all bitterness and wrath and anger and clamor and slander be put away from you, with all malice, and be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another as God in Christ forgave you." Christian love (which becomes an absurdity if it is objectified in isolation—i.e., considered apart from human affairs and from the "handling of people") is incomparably superior to knowledge (and even to faith, particularly when faith is presumed to rest on knowledge alone, and is not also "faith working through love"): "If I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing." Our intellectual understanding cannot be separated from our relationship with our neighbor: "If any man's will is to

do his [God's] will, he shall know whether the teaching is from God, or whether I am speaking on my own authority." "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God, and he who loves is born of God and knows God. He who does not love does not know God; for God is love." "Since you have done it to one of the least of these my brethren, you have done it to me."

Professor Roth concludes his article with a question: "Who will deny the Lutheran Church the right to prevent a man to speak for its faith when he preaches and teaches a gospel contrary to that which it has always preached?" Apart from a questionable rhetoric which assumes that the "Wisconsin affair" *eo ipso* established (1) what "the gospel which it has always preached" really is, and (2) that George Crist preached and taught a contrary gospel, the interest of truth requires that we question the question. Does any Christian ever have the right even to ask such a question? In particular, dare anyone ask such a question in the context of the present affair? When Professor Roth—or anyone else—dares to ask the question, "Who will deny the Lutheran Church the right . . . ?" the answer ought to be very quick in coming, "Christ denies that 'right'; surely he denies that 'right' at least until those who would claim it have first looked for the log in their own eye." Matthew 7:1-5 is also the Gospel.[2]

VICTOR K. WRIGLEY

2 The above communication is published in the interest of justice: *et audiatur altera pars.* It is not the intention of the QUARTERLY to continue a discussion of personal or procedural matters connected with the trials in question. However, the pages of the QUARTERLY will remain open to a discussion of any theological questions which may have been involved.—Editor.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

He that Cometh. By Sigmund Mowinckel, translated by G. W. Anderson. Nashville: Abingdon, 1956. 528 pages. $6.50.

Those who waited anxiously for the translation of Mowinckel's *Han som kommer* have been richly rewarded with the present volume in very readable English. The book brings us much more than the viewpoint of its author. The wealth of references to the work of other scholars provides insight into much research that has not been put into English. This is particularly valuable with regard to the Scandinavian publications which all too few Americans can read in the original.

Amid the comprehensive coverage of pertinent data and literature, Mowinckel makes careful evaluations. He refuses to be swept along by venturesome theories which he thinks suffer from too much speculation or generalization. He raises important questions about assuming a common pattern beneath all Near East myth and cult and insists on noting the differences in expression and usage at various places and times. He especially opposes any suggestion that Israelite practices represent a disintegration of the pattern and prefers to stress the creative impulses at work within Israel. Consequently he manifests a more cautious approach than in some of his earlier publications. Still he accepts many of the conclusions reached in recent study.

The author demonstrates his method at the outset by considering the ancient ideal of kingship. On this point, in accord with many other scholars, he finds a closer affinity for Israel with Mesopotamia than with Egypt. Besides his conviction that the king was not regarded as a god in Mesopotamia, he discovers terms that have Old Testament parallels. Such are "a man after the god's own heart" and the "image of God." Some of the terms suggest something divine about the king without identifying him as a deity. When the same concept is found in the Old Testament, some of the evidence may be questioned, but not all of it. II Samuel 7 certainly indicates that the Israelite king may be called "son of God" and thus opens the possibility that Ps. 2 would have reference to a contemporary monarch and that many another superhuman attribution mentioned in the psalms and prophets could be a poetic representation of the mediatorial role of the king. Chiefly, however, the king in Israel, as in Mesopotamia, was the representative of the people before God. In this way he fulfilled a priestly function, which Mowinckel believes is referred to in Ps. 110 under the figure of Melchizedek. Although the annual New Year Festival is held to be important for dramatizing the role of the king in Israel as in much of the rest of the Near East, Mowinckel emphasizes the distinctions. For example, he cannot think of psalms of lamentation as cultic representations of the death of the king which he shared with god. Instead, they portrayed the actual historical sufferings of the people. According to Mowinckel, there would have been no thought of death and resurrection of god among Israelites, in contrast to the Canaanites, but rather an annual renewal of the covenant and of the blessings which accompanied it.

Mowinckel rejects Gressmann's proposal of a primitive eschatology and reopens the whole question for discussion. The Day of the Lord in early Israel he believes to have referred to the manifestation of God at the New Year Festival. Second Isaiah transformed such ideas into a future hope with poems which were patterned after the liturgies of the festival and which pointed to a restoration from Exile with Yahweh as King. Expectation of return to the Davidic

---

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

dynasty held only a secondary place at the time.

Eschatology, as Mowinckel defines the term, came into Israelite circles with the adoption of a dualistic world view under influence from Persia. Though earlier descriptions of the future indulge in fantastic figures, they should not be called eschatology. Since the Messiah is an eschatological figure, according to Mowinckel, he does not appear in Jewish expectations until the last centuries before Christ. Then the rabbis and the Targums mixed earlier concepts about the rule of Yahweh with those about the king of the nation. They anticipated a Messiah who was chiefly a military victor. Concepts about judgment and resurrection came by way of confusion with the Son of Man, which in turn came from non-Israelite sources. Apocalyptic writers dwelt more upon the Son of Man than did the rabbis, and when they adapted this transcendent figure to messianic expectations, the result was millennialism. Judaism showed its distinctiveness by retaining faith in a single God who was supreme over all mediating figures and who maintained a special role for his chosen people.

Having long ago proved himself a master of modern historical method, Mowinckel has now set forth in a *magnum opus* his mature conclusions about the development of Jewish religion. His reconstruction of the history will be debated for a long time to come. One could immediately question whether his separate treatment of Messiah and Son of Man does not verge on unrealistic abstraction. Yet his organization of the material has enabled him to distinguish the various ideologies that influenced ancient Judaism. His summaries not only point up important distinctions but also draw together the various facets to provide a synthetic view of various schools of ancient thought. At many points Mowinckel has attained a perspicuity that will aid in future discussions. One example would be his distinction between the myth of the Primordial Man and stories about the first man.

The narrow definition of eschatology and messianism will cause problems for both historians and theologians. The historians will continue to check Mowinckel's interpretation of the data. The theologians should consider the serious place that time sequences had in ancient eschatology, and then raise further questions about using the term "eschatology" for qualitative values without reference to time.

Any who are interested in biblical interpretation will relish the review of terms important for Old Testament theology. Righteousness, salvation, peace, blessing, eternity, and the like are not given new definitions but are used with their correct historical connotations. Many New Testament passages also receive attention and are elucidated in terms of historical antecedents.

Mowinckel cannot tolerate any attempt to write history to suit the presuppositions of a dogmatic theology. In the exegesis of "messianic" passages he never follows an orthodox interpretation. His lengthy treatment of the Isaiah servant songs rejects both the messianic possibilities and any extensive dependence upon the king ideology or the myth of the dying and rising god. The suffering servant was a prophet. Yet Mowinckel maintains, "It is with justice that the church has from the very beginning seen in Jesus Christ the true fulfillment of these prophecies." What may here seem a peculiar twist to many readers is repeated on many occasions by the author. His view is in part explained when he considers Is. 7:14. He prefers to believe that the mother of Immanuel was the wife of Ahaz. Because Ahaz lacked faith, however, the sign waited for fulfillment until the time of Jesus. This is Mowinckel's way of maintaining erudition as an historian at the same time that he is committed to the kerygma of the church.

Whether one agrees with Mowinckel little or much, one cannot read *He That Cometh* without benefit. One must conclude that the book is a truly monumental work, a peer among recent efforts to portray Old Testament and Jewish hope and the Messiah.

ROBERT J. MARSHALL

Early Israel in Recent History Writing. By John Bright. Chicago: A. R. Allenson, Inc., 1956. 128 pages. $1.75.

Professor Bright's review of the work of the Alt-Noth school and Yehezkel Kauf-

mann's criticism of that school is Number 19 in the series known as "Studies in Biblical Theology." He has performed a valuable service for those students of the Old Testament who are unable to read German because some of the most significant contributions toward an understanding of the history of Israel have come from the Alt-Noth school.

As is well known Prof. Noth in two extremely challenging works—*Geschichte Israels* (1954) and *Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs* (1948)—holds that the history of Israel begins with the Twelve-Tribe League in Palestine and not with the patriarchal period detailed in the Pentateuch. Hence he begins his history of Israel with the settlement of the tribes in the land and pays little or no attention to the early stories. He is not impressed by the significant archaeological contributions of recent years. He holds the main outline of the Graf-Wellhausen literary theory but believes that J and E are parallel accounts going back to a common source (G) whose character can be seen where both J and E coincide. E is too fragmentary to reconstruct.

Yehezkel Kaufmann, an Israeli scholar, has undertaken to criticize the work of Alt-Noth by proposing a rather novel theory of literary criticism in which he believes that the composition of the books of Joshua and Judges occurred very near to the events they relate. But in essence that is really no criticism at all since it does not fairly evaluate the sources of the books in question.

Bright points to some healthy aspects of a view such as that proposed by Kaufmann but acknowledges its basic inadequacy in others. He also agrees with the main elements of the Alt-Noth school but he rightly quarrels with its unsatisfactory view of the early history of Israel, its lack of appreciation of archaeological data bearing on the period with consequent depreciation of the period itself as having much of historical worth.

The work is very well executed and is a welcome addition to any introduction to the Old Testament which does not go beyond the materials handled, e.g., by R. H. Pfeiffer. It is a splendid introduction to the extended works of Noth (mentioned above) and of Alt collected in the two-volume work of essays entitled *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte Israels,* which is must reading for every serious student of the Bible.

Jacob M. Myers

The Messiah in the Old Testament. By Helmer Ringgren. Chicago: A. R. Allenson, Inc., 1956. 71 pages. $1.50.

This is Number 18 in the "Studies in Biblical Theology" series and, like most of the previous monographs, is a provocative study of the subject set forth in the title. The problem of the Messiah in the Old Testament has received increasing attention from Bible theologians, especially the various Scandinavian schools.

Our author deals first with the subject of the Royal Psalms (Pss. 2, 110, 21, 45, 132, 8) from which he concludes that in Israel "The king is the Anointed of Yahweh, he is set up by him and proclaimed as his son, he shall maintain right and righteousness in the country, he conveys to his people divine blessing . . . , he defeats in divine power all enemies, he rules over the whole world, and his throne shall stand eternally" (p. 20). This idea of divine kingship is the background and soul out of which the Messianic hope came. The divine king concept is to a certain degree common in the ancient oriental world, though there is some difference in detail between the king ideology in Egypt and Mesopotamia as Frankfort has observed (*Kingship and the Gods,* p. 3 ff.).

Next the several Messianic prophecies are considered (Is. 7, 9, 11, 61; Mic. 5; Jer. 23:5-6; 33:15-16; Zech. 9). They contain the same fundamental elements observed in the Royal Psalms, only here we have the transference of the hope expressed in the enthronement or New Year's festival to the future, thus giving rise to an eschatological pattern, a preparation for Christ.

The great servant passages of Isaiah (42, 49, 50, 52-53) possess two motifs: Tammuz liturgies and the kingship pattern. They are combined here in the belief that the passages do reflect some knowledge of the Babylonian king humiliated symbolically at the New

Year festival. "There is much to speak in favor of such an assumption" (p. 52). In addition to the servant passages, the author points out certain Servant Psalms (Pss. 18, 22, 49, 69, 86, 88, 116, 118; Is. 38:10-20) which reflect the same characteristics as the servant songs themselves.

In a final chapter the question is asked, "Is the Servant the Messiah?" The answer is yes. What the king is to Israel, Israel as the servant is to the nations. Just as the king does penance for the people, so Israel's mission, concentrated in Christ, is for the world. "Even if the prophet does not actually have Christ in mind when uttering the words of the servant, he has defined the idea of vicarious suffering so sharply that the New Testament interpretation of the work of Jesus is hardly conceivable without the servant songs as its background" (p. 66).

This is a challenging piece of work and, while we may not follow him all the way, the author has set forth ideas which must be taken into consideration by all students of Messianism. But it must be studied in conjunction with Engnell's *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East,* Bentzen's *King and Messiah,* and Mowinckel's *He that Cometh.*

Jacob M. Myers

An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments. By Neville Clark. Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1956. 89 pages. $1.50.

This monograph is Number 17 in the series, "Studies in Biblical Theology." The author discusses baptism and the Lord's Supper separately, and concludes with a chapter, "Towards a Theology of the Sacraments."

At the beginning of the New Testament stands the baptism of John, which the author describes as "initiatory, ethical, eschatological, and universal." Its background was Jewish proselyte baptism and purifications; its new element was the preparation for the coming of the Messiah. It was a last attempt to achieve salvation by works, by preparing a people ready and worthy to receive the kingdom. When Jesus is baptized by John, a new element enters, and baptism by the Spirit is in him already a reality.

In Acts the practice of Christian baptism in water and the Spirit is from the first taken for granted. Mr. Clark tries to find a connection between John's baptism and the baptism of Jesus on the one hand, and the practice of Christian baptism in Acts. Jesus himself did not baptize, but possibly his disciples did. The connection is found in Jesus' words about his death as a baptism in Lk. 12:50, and the promise to the disciples: "With the baptism I am baptized with shall you be baptized." These words indicate that "baptism is, in the last resort and on the deepest level, the cross" (p. 17). Baptism in water and the Spirit in Acts is the baptism of Jesus, the initiation into the new age.

It was Paul who gave baptism its full Christian significance. In baptism the believer is united with Christ, incorporated into the body of Christ and raised to a new life. Baptism is the foundation of the new ethical life. But Paul is not introducing something new here; he merely unfolds the significance of baptism in water and the Spirit with which the church began.

On the Lord's Supper the author discusses first the question whether the occasion was the Passover, the Kiddush, or the Haburoth. He discounts the arguments which have been advanced in favor of these observances and suggests that the meal was an ordinary Jewish meal at which certain religious observances always took place. The institution of the Eucharist took place within the larger framework of this Jewish meal. Accordingly we find in Acts that the "breaking of bread" was a common religious meal which included both Agape and Eucharist. Due to various circumstances, some of which we see in Paul's discussion in I Corinthians, the Eucharist became separated from the Agape feast.

The significance of the Lord's Supper was from the beginning a sacrifice inseparably connected with the Cross. The "remembrance" is not merely recalling a past event in memory; it is "the bringing of Christ crucified out of the past into the present, for the 're-calling' of his sacrifice before God, thus making it here and now operative" (p. 62). In the Eucharist there are two

factors: "the constant factor of the presence and action of the one Christ, and the reality of the concept of the body of Christ as applied to both church and sacrament." By participating in his sacrifice the church becomes the eschatological community waiting for the day "when the church under the cross shall at last put off the garment of her humiliation and the *regnum gratiae* give place to the *regnum gloriae*."

In the last chapter the author suggests certain basic considerations for the development of a theology of the sacraments. He suggests that such a theology must place the sacraments in the context of both the doctrine of creation and the doctrine of redemption. Consideration must be given also to Christology and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. To relate baptism to the Spirit and the Lord's Supper to the risen Christ is not a proper solution. The sacraments must be interpreted in the whole context of the Christian faith.

It is quite apparent that the author discusses the sacraments against the background of British theology. In the extensive bibliography there are a number of French and German authors listed, as well as English, but only one Scandinavian, N. A. Dahl. Y. Brilioth's *Eucharistic Faith and Practice* is not listed. A study of the theology of the sacraments in the New Testament should, of course, be objective and uninfluenced by contemporary interpretations, but the emphasis nevertheless tends to reflect the present situation. The author has succeeded, however, in presenting a reasonably objective presentation of the New Testament material, and his work will prove helpful and interesting to all interested in a scriptural doctrine of the sacraments.

E. H. Wahlstrom

Luther's Works. Volume 21: The Sermon on the Mount and The Magnificat. By Jaroslav Pelikan, editor. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956. 383 pages.

Ours is a day of "practical Christianity." Religion must be "related to life." Martin Luther was no professional psychologist and had never been exposed to a twentieth century course in pastoral counseling but his writings throb with "relatedness" to life. This volume, the second to be published of the new 55-volume American edition of Luther's works, includes his exposition of the Sermon on the Mount and the Magnificat. The commentary on the Sermon on the Mount is based on sermons preached by Luther while he substituted for Bugenhagen in Wittenberg during the years 1530-32 and the Magnificat originated as a tract begun before Luther went to Worms in 1520 and completed while he was at the Wartburg.

The place to begin reading this volume is at page 285, the postscript to the commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. Here in ten pages Luther presents, with a brevity not too common in his writings and with a clarity which we have come to expect in them, an exposition of the place of "good works" in the Christian life. With force and conviction he condemns the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount which would make of it a rule for entering the kingdom rather than a guide for those who are already its disciples. "Christ is saying nothing in this sermon about how we become Christians, but only about the works and fruit that no one can do unless he already is a Christian and in a state of grace" (p. 291). Here Luther makes clear the case for rewards in the Christian life, carefully distinguishing them from the concept of salvation by grace and relating them to it. This postscript should really take its place alongside *The Freedom of the Christian Man* as a primer in Christian ethics.

It is marvelous to see how Luther gets Christ to deal with sixteenth century Germany's problems. No doubt it is the genius of the Reformer which accounts for the way in which he avoids nice conclusions about what Jesus said and instead brings the meaning of the text to bear on contemporary issues. So, speaking of Christ's admonition, "You are the light of the world," Luther finds ready reference here to the darkness of the papacy and the duty of every Christian to testify against Roman errors. And Christ's teaching concerning adultery and divorce receive amplification in terms of monks who run from the world only to

spend time in evil thoughts. And, contrariwise, these same words of Christ teach the blessedness of husband and wife desiring each other.

Luther's high regard for governmental authority is demonstrated in his distinction between using an oath for "selfish" reasons and because the state has required it. The same is true of war and killing. The government exercises an authority which it has received from God and by which it may require of the Christian behavior which, under any other circumstances than obedience to authority, would be sin. So "killing is right, yet it is also wrong" (p. 99). This seemingly dual system of ethics has brought charges of ethical blindness or even duplicity against Luther and Lutherans. For Luther there seemed to be no problem here. "There is no getting around it, a Christian has to be a secular person of some sort. As regards his own person, according to his life as a Christian, he is in subjection to no one but Christ, without any obligation either to the emperor or to any other man. But at least outwardly, according to his body and property, he is related by subjection and obligation to the emperor, inasmuch as he occupies some office or station in life or has a house and home, a wife and children; for all these are things that pertain to the emperor" (p. 109). Later generations struggling with a Nazi or Communist government, or even living under a paternalizing American state, have not always seen this distinction as clearly as Luther did.

Luther hits hard at what we term "legalism." He has no time for those whose teaching deals "only with the sin and piety that are manifest in outward works" (p. 105).

In "The Magnificat" Luther emphasizes the blessedness of Mary who knows herself to be the object of God's mercy. Luther sees Mary's greatness in her knowledge that God has done great things for her and with her in spite of her unworthiness, and similarly Luther sees the power and might of God as doing the opposite to those who are unwilling to be his or to be used for his purposes.

These two works of Luther remind us again of his strange freedom with the Scripture. Truly he was bound by what God has spoken. Honesty of interpretation was the first rule of Luther's biblical work. But he is still a free man as he roams the sacred books and develops their grand theme of redemption. So he can classify the synoptics as books which do not stress "the profound doctrine of Christ" as do the works of Paul and John. To him this is no defect or problem. It is simply a matter of seeing the Bible whole and dealing with it in context. Luther is casually certain that "Matthew, Luke, and Mark considered and emphasized the other issue [importance of good works] to make sure it was not forgotten" (p. 65).

And of course Luther's frank and direct manner of speaking is as clear here as anywhere in his writings. He does not intend to be misunderstood. He says enough to be sure all will know what he means (indeed sometimes he says more!) and yet the reader is strangely held by the expectation that the next paragraph or the next sentence may be a literary or spiritual jewel. This characteristic, and the suddenness with which he is able to change the pace, mood, or even the subject matter of what he is writing, give Luther's work a fascination which holds the interest of the reader and brings him back for more.

In this connection it must also be said that one of the fine features of the volume is the expert manner of both the translation and the editing. The translation is smooth and readable. Where necessary, footnotes have been used to add clarity. And in true Luther style new words have been substituted for old where it is thought necessary in order to convey to the English reader the original meaning.

This begins to sound like an attempt to sell Luther. That is not necessary.

SIDNEY A. RAND

Kierkegaard Commentary. By T. H. Croxall. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956. xix, 263 pages. $5.00.

In the introduction to this book Dr. Croxall points out the rapidity which characterized the work of translating Kierkegaard into English with the resultant mistakes in the translations. I fully agree with him that

the present translations badly need revision and that they often constitute a major handicap for students of Kierkegaard who are unable to read Danish. It is quite true, as Croxall states, that "the primary need for English readers of explaining, sorting out, and commenting upon the actual words that Kierkegaard wrote has not yet been met." One of the tasks which the author aims to accomplish in this book is therefore that of "retranslating or refurbishing the extant English translations."

Croxall is quite right that in approaching Kierkegaard it is essential to realize that there is a definite and progressive plan in his authorship, and that he was a religious author from the beginning. Croxall also points out the need of making a sharp distinction between Kierkegaard's thought and contemporary non-Christian existentialism. Failure to make such distinction has made him "one of the most maltreated thinkers of the last centuries (Weiland)."

As a *Kierkegaard Commentary* Croxall's book lacks an adequate plan. The first three chapters deal with Kierkegaard's terminology, but in a very inadequate manner. Such categories as *the individual, reduplication, double reflection, the leap, kinesis,* and *resignation* cannot be dismissed in a perfunctory manner in a work which proposes to be a *Kierkegaard Commentary.* Six chapters deal with *Either/Or* and *Stages on Life's Way* under such headings as "Pleasure," "Music," "Tragedy, Imagination and Boredom," "Seduction and Suffering," "Women and Wine," "Marriage and Duty." A lot of information is furnished, but one does not come to grips with the movement in Kierkegaard's own thought.

Two chapters dealing with *Repetition* and *Fear and Trembling,* and two chapters on the *Philosophical Fragments* are among the best in the book. They introduce into and follow the respective arguments in these works. Apart from a chapter which deals with *Works of Love,* there is in this commentary no other chapter that introduces the decisive Christian works of Kierkegaard, and that in spite of the fact that the author regards Kierkegaard as "a profound Christian." Instead, there is a chapter dealing with Kierkegaard's Christology (13 pages), where citations from the Christian works are dealt with under such headings as "Incarnation," "Incognito," "Offense," "Atonement," etc., including even a paragraph on "the Second Coming."

To offer a *Kierkegaard Commentary* in which the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* receives only incidental reference cannot be justified. Neither are there in this book treatments of *The Concept of Dread* and *The Sickness unto Death.* In the treatment of *Either/Or* there is no treatment of the category of "the self," nor is there in *Fear and Trembling* an adequate treatment, if any, of the categories "the absurd," "the demoniacal" and "*Anfechtung.*"

Croxall calls attention to the subtitle of the *Works of Love,* "Some Christian Reflections in the Form of Discourses." I am surprised that he does not seem to recognize that the term *Overveielse,* which he translates "reflection," is used by Kierkegaard in a conceptual sense and that it involves a deliberate weighing of alternatives. For that reason the term can hardly be translated "reflection." It would be better to use the word "deliberation," though this does not cover the Danish term. To illustrate the point I quote from *The Gospel of Suffering* (page 118 f.; I have altered the translation): "To deliberate (Ger., *zu erwägen*) is derived from to weigh (Ger., *zu wägen*). We say that the scales weigh or that one weighs on the scale. Exactly what does it mean to weigh? It means to state indifferently the relationship between two magnitudes, or to indicate this relationship indifferently. . . . The scales are entirely indifferent as to which of the two weighs more, they merely indicate the weight and have no preference for one side or the other. . . . Consequently we weigh on the scales, but a man deliberates (Ger., *erwägt*). . . . In order to deliberate (*zu erwägen*), the man must himself be or have a third with respect to the two magnitudes."

In the quotation on page 220 Croxall states that the purpose of reflection [*Erwägung*] is to "*awake* and stir people, and sharpen their thoughts. Reflection's moment is before action, and its value is that it sets all the

factors correctly in motion. Reflection should be a kind of 'brake.'" The last sentence is a serious mistranslation. The Danish word *Bremse* may mean both a "brake" and a "gadfly." In this case it should be translated "gadfly" (cf. the Socratic "gadfly"), which also fits the *Erwägung* with its implication, to awaken and stir. In the footnote, the reference is to *Papirer* VIII:2 B 28-78, as indicated by the *loc. cit.* The reference is incorrect. It should be *Papirer* VIII:1 A 293.

Croxall does not favor the term "Edifying Discourses" as a translation of the Danish *Opbyggelige Taler*. The term "edify" sounds bad in English ears. Instead he suggests "Devotional (or Spiritual) Talks (or Addresses)." However, "edify" is after all a New Testament term. Kierkegaard used the term in the New Testament sense of *oikodomeo*. Croxall himself refers to this New Testament term on page 223. I cannot conceive of translating the New Testament term as "spiritual" or "devotional." Kierkegaard used the term in the New Testament sense of building up.

Unfortunately Croxall in this book does not always distinguish between a quotation and a paraphrase. Thus on pages 170 f. and 193 there are what are indicated as quotations and which should have been marked paraphrase. In the footnotes the author indiscriminately uses English and German titles when the reference is to a German publication. For instance, why speak of Hegel's *Geschichte der Philosophie* and of Tennemann's *History of Philosophy* in the footnotes when both references are to the German editions? Other times when the footnotes refer to a page in Hegel's *Wissenschaft der Logik*, Croxall writes Hegel's *Science of Logic*.

There is no way of knowing when a parenthesis in a quotation is an explanatory note by Kierkegaard or a note by Croxall. Sometimes the author places his own explanations in parentheses within a quotation, and at other times the parenthesis belongs in Kierkegaard's text. Sometimes Croxall uses italics where Kierkegaard used none, and at other times he omits Kierkegaard's italics, and all of it without a reference to what is what.

It is most unfortunate that the quotations and footnotes were not more carefully checked before printing, for in its present form the book gives the impression both of haste and of inaccuracy, something which the author deplores in other translations. For information, let me add that the quotation on page 209, to which, Croxall deplores, he has lost the reference, is found in *Papirer* VIII:1 A 320. It is also badly translated.

REIDAR THOMTE

The Times Test the Church. By Frederick K. Wentz. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1956. 154 pages. $1.95.

The author provides the Lutheran preacher with an articulated *Weltanschauung*, particularly in his first chapter, "Where Do We Stand in Human History?" Dr. Wentz crystalizes those implications of Scripture which the preacher has always worked with but has not seen clearly; he has a grasp of history which affords him an integrated view of the whole. So the book attempts (successfully) what Lutheran preaching attempts: not to provide still another human system but to look at the world through the sight which God's Word provides.

This book is rich with content and stimulating in style. The connoisseur of apt phrases will appreciate the pungent language. Just one sample: "Witnessing often consists, not so much of buttonholing people, but of making one's workbench a contagion-center for God's forgiving grace as it works among sinners" (p. 37).

The "Epilogue" handily sums up the author's findings; here are a few lines therefrom: "Three threads of interpretation have run through the fabric of this discussion. One is that good and evil can and do grow simultaneously in the historical process. A second basic principle is that the church's life and progress always depend upon revival, that is, upon new life contributed by the Holy Spirit to human undertakings. Thirdly, such newness of life, produced by a Spirit that blows unpredictably, like the wind, evidences itself most clearly and com-

pellingly in dedicated and creative minorities" (p. 152).

A. C. Rueter

A Theology for Christian Stewardship. By T. A. Kantonen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1956. 126 pages. Cloth $2, paper $1.25.

Here is a book on stewardship that is more comprehensive and more thorough than any that has come to the attention of this reviewer. The author in his foreword asks: "What is this thing that you call stewardship? If it represents only clever means which practical-minded Americans have devised for raising money, interest in it soon subsides. But if it can be shown to be vital Christian faith in action, revealing its power to transform all areas of life, then it raises the hope that here may be the beginning of a new awakening and renewal, a new coming of the Spirit."

Through eight chapters, Dr. Kantonen shows how very much more than money is involved in Christian stewardship. This book should be extremely helpful to pastors. Laymen will find it stimulating also. This reviewer heard the original lectures on which this book is based, and Dr. Kantonen has the facility of "getting across" in print in the same way that he does in person. This book is a wonderful answer to the person who has thought that stewardship is not spiritual or is not undergirded by a profound theology. We recommend it heartily.

Clyde J. Grimstvedt

The Prayers of Jesus. By Ralph Spaulding Cushman. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955. 125 pages. $1.75.

This little book might be described as "an invitation to a more vital prayer life." Its purpose is devotional. It does not attempt a profound study of prayer in general, nor of the recorded prayers of Jesus; however, it may well lead someone to undertake this study. It answers the question, "Lord, teach us how to pray," by an analysis of the content of all of Jesus' recorded prayers. The outstanding characteristic of these prayers is that they reveal the intimate personal relationship between Jesus and the Father. This devotional study seeks to "lead modern disciples into a new Mount of Transfiguration" where, beholding Christ, their prayers will become vital, i.e., related to the meaning and purpose of life.

The longest recorded prayer of Jesus is found in John 17. Fourteen of the twenty-one meditations are based on this high priestly prayer. However, the author does not attempt to expound the whole chapter. Eleven of the fourteen meditations are on the first six verses, and there follows one meditation on each of the following verses: 9, 21, and 24. The remainder of the book contains the following meditations: Two on the Lord's Prayer, one each on these prayers of Jesus: at the return of the Seventy, at Lazarus' tomb, at the request of the Greeks, in Gethsemane, and from the Cross.

The book has real value for the average Christian who is seeking to enrich his prayer life, and therefore his relationship to God. The value and beauty of the book is greatly enhanced also by the inclusion of an original poem along with each meditation.

Maurice S. Molvik

A Theological German Vocabulary. By Walter M. Mosse. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955. Paper, 148 pages. $2.50.

An evidence of revived interest in German among students of theology is this alphabetical list of key words which appear frequently in German theological literature. About half of the terms are biblical, and each of these is defined with an equivalent or two in English and with a brief quotation from Luther's German Bible and the RSV. Non-biblical terms are provided only with English equivalents. The little book should not be mistaken for a lexicon; as the title indicates, it is a list of key words for learners of the language in a specialized field.

Theodore G. Tappert

An Historian's Approach to Religion. By Arnold Toynbee. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. 318 pages. $5.

In the preface the noted historian, Arnold Toynbee, confesses that he gave these Gifford

lectures (Edinburgh, 1952-53) and wrote this book because he had reached a point in his life at which "the question, 'what is our attitude towards Religion?' was calling for an answer too insistently" for him to be able to ignore it any longer. As he says, the common experience of our time—"the quickening touch of Adversity"—has reminded us all of religion, and so here we have a Toynbeean *Religio Historici* (a title Toynbee himself favored) after the manner of Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici.*

The book, as Toynbee admits, necessarily covers some of the same ground as his massive work, *A Study of History,* and the many references to the latter in this volume bear that out. But as a "religious" abridgement and interpretation of the larger work, this is a valuable volume and has the advantage of coming from the author himself.

As an historian Toynbee sees his task as one of attempting to correct the self-centeredness of man and all life on earth. History, he says, is one of mankind's most recent acquisitions, and while he concedes that the historian transcends self-centeredness only partially and imperfectly, nevertheless Toynbee believes the historian can widen our mental horizons concerning what he feels is the greatest cultural task of our times, namely, bridging the chasm between the Judaic group of ideologies and religions—Communism, Liberalism, Christianity, Islam, and Judaism—and the Buddhic group of philosophies and religions—post-Buddhic Hinduism, Mahayana and Hinayana Buddhism.

In the first part of the book, "The Dawn of the Higher Religions," Toynbee traces the genesis of religion from nature-worship to man-worship, the latter appearing in progressive forms of idolization—of the local community (as Sumer or Athens), of the ecumenical community (as the Roman or British empires), and finally of the self-sufficient philosopher (as Socrates). Man-worship is a "religious expression of self-centeredness," however, and it breaks down in the face of suffering. Out of the experience of suffering the higher religions have arisen, giving a vision of a God of love and not merely one of power. The two best expressions of higher religion are Mahayana Buddhism and Christianity. Hinayana Buddhism is regarded as inferior because it seeks to reject desire altogether instead of facing the fact of suffering in a positive way. Toynbee devotes the latter chapters of this part to showing how even higher religions may be seduced from their central concerns by encounters with idolized empires or with philosophies, by the diversion of mundane tasks, and by the idolization of their own religious institutions.

In the second part, "Religion in a Westernizing World," of about the same length as the first, Toynbee discusses modern Western civilization and its encounter with higher religion, especially Christianity. Among these chapters he inserts several chapters of quotations from writers of the past four centuries, particularly John Locke and Pierre Bayle. In this part Toynbee points up the breakdown of a Christian way of life in the modern West, and the corresponding secularization of the West. He is troubled by modern man's self-assurance, and derides the attempt of modern man to deny the doctrine of original sin while being unable to discard original sin itself, so well-evidenced in the public atrocities of our times. Toynbee's analysis of some contemporary idols—Nationalism, Ecumenicalism (of the state), and the Technician—is quite illuminating.

Today Toynbee sees these idols as failing if not already failures. But we live in a twentieth century Westernizing world, with all the world becoming more and more technological, bringing with it more and more regimentation to cope with the machines and the need for security. The only real field left for freedom, says Toynbee, may well be in the realm of the spirit, in religion. In a chapter on the essence and non-essentials in religion, he seeks to ascertain the essence of all higher religion. This he finds in the belief in a spiritual presence in the universe greater than man, and that man's goal is to seek communion with this presence. The first requisite is to get rid of self-centeredness. Mahayana Buddhism and Christianity are again exalted as bringing out more explicitly that a superhuman being has demonstrated his love in action at the cost of suffering.

The final chapter, "Selves, Suffering, Self-centeredness, and Love," brings a new appreciation of Toynbee's viewpoint, which begins: "No human soul can pass through this life without being challenged to grapple with the mystery of the universe." If curiosity does not bring us to it, "experience will drive us to it—above all, the experience of suffering." He appeals to us who believe our own religion to be the way and the truth to admit that we know only in part and to be tolerant of the other higher religions, for "there is not any one alive who is effectively in a position to judge between his own religion and his neighbor's." The missions of the higher religions are not competitive but complementary. There can be no one road, as Symmachus told Ambrose, and Toynbee opts for Symmachus.

There can be no doubt of the appeal of the large generosity and kindly tolerance of the historical approach to the problem of religion, but its limitations are clear also. Unless it wishes to become philosophy of religion, it cannot do more than survey the various religions and observe similarities and differences. It should not do what Toynbee dares to do: adopt the historical approach as a philosophy of religion. In fact, Toynbee believes historical study must go beyond a representation of history as mere flux and must answer the question: "What is the nature of the universe?" It is doubtful that his own eclectic approach is so self-evidently the correct approach, however, as it may appear to be to an historian. To suggest that the various religions have all believed they had the true revelation does not rule out, as Toynbee believes, the possibility that one of them may have it. Because they cannot all of them be right does not prove they must all be wrong! The claim of Jesus the Christ to be *the* way, *the* truth, and *the* life may be an offense to an eclectic approach, but it cannot be dismissed by an *a priori* belief in the relativity of all revelations. The Christian revelation can well be the judgment on all supposed revelations, as well as their fulfillment.

This reviewer also finds difficulty with Toynbee's oversimplified version of the approaches to truth, which he considers to be poetical and scientific. Religion to him is a poetic approach, and theology is a perversion of true religion since it is trying to be scientific with poetry. His understanding of metaphysics as a "comprehensive view of scientific truth" and thus "an interim provisional report on the general progress of science up to date" is simply historical relativism a la Dilthey and Collingwood. Here one prefers James B. Conant's division of knowledge into science, poetry, and philosophy, in which the latter two are considered non-historical areas, that is, in which later knowledge does not necessarily displace earlier knowledge. One could add religion to such a division perhaps. Leastwise, Toynbee's uncritical and historicizing view of knowledge is a severe limitation on some of his judgments.

At any rate one gets the feeling from reading this book that an historian's approach needs to be both more historical and more critical. It is peculiar that he does not seem to appreciate the uniquely "historical" nature of Christianity in comparison with other religions. And to all purposes he ignores the Reformation, except for a few derogatory remarks about the religious wars provoked by it. The book still is an interesting one, and one cannot doubt Toynbee's sincerity and concern, but one wishes for a more penetrating analysis of the problem.

WILLIAM H. K. NARUM

The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry. By H. Richard Niebuhr. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956. 134 pages. $2.50.

By this time nearly everyone connected with American theological education has heard of, and in many instances has studied, this book. Under the direction of the American Association of Theological Schools and with the financial support of the Carnegie Corporation a study staff headed by Professor Niebuhr is conducting an inquiry into the nature, purpose, and effectiveness of theological education. "The Study of Theological Education in the United States and Canada," as the project is called, has resulted in three relatively independent publications. This is the first of the series.

It is clear from the first chapter that the author and his collaborators (Daniel Day Williams and James M. Gustafson) feel under the necessity of defining the nature and purpose of the church as the essential context in which to understand the ministry. One of the sections of this chapter is called "The Purpose of the Church: The Increase of the Love of God and Neighbor." There are three comments that come to mind at this point. The first is that this reviewer feels unsatisfied with the statement as it stands but confesses a reluctance to challenge it as a scripturally correct description. The second is that this section contains as inspiring an analysis of love (p. 35) as he has ever read, a presentation that certainly must have grown out of long meditation on Paul's own rhapsodic "the greatest of these. . . ." The third comment which rises out of reading this section is that Niebuhr gives no clear answer to the question, "How can we love God and neighbor?" Here, it seems to me, he misses the Gospel, the radical gratitude which it creates, and the indwelling or informing of the believer by the Holy Spirit.

In the second chapter Niebuhr introduces his reader to a new term for the modern American minister: "pastoral director." Clearly this designation is subject to misunderstanding. Is the minister a sort of ecclesiastical executive, the congregational "manager" who issues orders and "oils the machinery?" Or is he a shepherd who guides and *directs* his flock? Somebody has recently said that Niebuhr's phrase is satisfactory if you put the accent in the right place: "*pastoral* director," not "pastoral *director*."

The third chapter describes the seminary as "the intellectual center of the church's life." The author is aware that to describe the seminary in this way will provoke the criticism of anti-intellectuals within the church and anti-clericals outside the church, both of whom will object "to the close correlation of intellect and church." But, argues Niebuhr, the seminary must be the intellectual center because theology, which it purposes to teach, is an intellectual discipline. In this community of intellectual activity at the heart of the church reflection and criticism are brought to bear on the chief activities of the church: worship, preaching, teaching, and the care of souls.

When one puts down a book like this and then learns that its appearance is symptomatic of a healthy self-critical attitude which is pervading theological education not only in America but all over the world, one cannot but rejoice that such stirrings are abroad in men's hearts. For it is true that theologians and educators everywhere are being moved to question, to analyze, to evaluate, and to improve the processes of ministerial education in our day. The Niebuhr study is the major American contribution in this area of concern, and we are happy that it is being set forth in such a candid fashion. Not only is this attitude of self-examination good for the immediate purpose of focusing attention on theological education, but also for the fact that, in so doing, it forces us all to examine again the nature of the church and the ministry.

E. Clifford Nelson

Counseling and Theology. By William E. Hulme. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1956. 250 pages. $3.75.

"Protestant churches have suffered from the naive reaction that a knowledge of theology is at best only incidental to the quality of religious experience, as though religion were the one exception to the value of education for the enrichment of experience." Multiply this statement of need by the factor, "It should be obvious that the principles of counseling do not have to become religious to adapt to pastoral counseling; they already are religious." The result is this book of Dr. Hulme's, whose aim is stated as, "Our challenge therefore is to incorporate the pastor's own heritage into pastoral counseling—to bolster its psychological framework with a theological foundation—to the strengthening of this personal ministry to people with problems" (p. 11).

It was with some reluctance that this book was accepted for review. If a book on counseling and *theology,* why not one also on the theology of the split-t, or a theology of rose gardening? What is there in counseling which merits a survey through the categories of theology? After all, the inter-

relatedness of two people to their mutual benefit might be sociology, or ethics, or social welfare, or pastoral servicing. But do we help to get hold of the problems of their interrelating with these theological handles? I can well imagine that many whose ministry could be deeply enriched through using this book will fail to read it as they are motivated by this questioning reluctance.

If they do fail, it will be to their disadvantage. For Dr. Hulme has given us one of the finest statements of client-centered counseling that I have read. This is developed in the four chapters dedicated to the needs of the troubled personality: the need for a listener, for confession, for understanding, and for growth.

In the analysis of these needs he establishes that they are intimately conjoined to the theological presuppositions about man and his world. These presuppositions are of course built into the pastor's apperceptive response with which he greets the counseling situation, whether the presuppositions are acknowledged or not. So, "The philosophic structure of counseling rests upon the prerogative of the individual to make his own decisions regarding choices that affect his life" (p. 80). As this is expanded, it becomes apparent that as far as the pastor at least is concerned, this is not a philosophic idea at all, but a theological. Man owes total responsibility for his own life to God alone. No one else can accept this burden for anyone else, despite our frequent eagerness to drive the sheep where we as shepherds want them to go.

The effort in the remainder of the book to express the fundamental theological categories, supported by quotations from the chief Protestant confessions, in terms of counseling dynamics, is less strong, it would seem. Can we really state our theology in terms of psychological functions? Dr. Hulme does not explain them as the producers of theology; he seems to say that the descriptions are interchangeable. "If you say it in theology, you say 'justification by faith'; if you use the language of personality dynamics you would say it as 'The Means of Acceptance.'" Thus the book seems to assert. But does this really exhaust the theology of *sola fide?* Despite its less convincing aspects, this part of the book will yield many helpful insights. It will surely underline the functional, personal, living aspects of all our theology, and will help disabuse the frequent assertion that classic Lutheran theology is dry as dust.

Beyond the typical books in this area, Dr. Hulme shows us how to use the Bible and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in a healing process. Selected portions of the Bible may be prescribed as "homework" or bibliotherapy. That this is fraught with considerable danger the author recognizes. Its abuse, as a pink pill for every illness, should not blind us to the fact that pink pills can be specifically prescribed if we know what we are about.

The theology stumbles in one place where it ascribes the difference in the Lord's Supper between Calvinist or Zwinglian views and that of Luther to the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity. Was it not true that this was the precise assertion that Luther did not make? Our hope in the real presence does not rest on metaphysical correlates of ubiquity, but on promissory grounds. It is a "sacramental" presence, not a definitive mode, which is our certainty.

By contrast, the clear way in which Dr. Hulme asserts that giving the Gospel as a straight piece of information must be adhered to, instead of drawing the Gospel out of the counselee, is refreshing and thankworthy. The Gospel is always beyond what eye hath seen or ear heard. And the counseling process as such is not redemptive. The Good News is always good *news.* His stand here will no doubt be resented by those who do not understand the truth that the Word is *the* means of grace.

For future editions of the book, "the shadow" (p. 136) should be ascribed to Jung instead of to Jung's disciple, Fritz Kunkel.

This book digs down a pillar, down to bedrock, for the bridge from theology to psychology, the bridge which must be erected in our age, and which will be erected in any case. For man is inescapably theological as well as psychological.

GEORGE H. MUEDEKING